Geography Lessons, Bridge-Building, and Second Language Writers

Talinn Phillips, Candace Stewart, and Robert D. Stewart

Our university sits in rural southeastern Ohio, not far from the Ohio River. The river forms the border between Ohio and West Virginia to the south, and farther west, between Ohio and Kentucky. Driving across the border, one quickly notices just how many bridges span the Ohio River. Towns and cities are scattered all along the border, and even the small towns typically have at least two bridges. Residents here would never dream of building just one bridge to get people from Ohio to West Virginia, since one bridge could never hope to meet everyone's needs. We all start from different locations, move to various destinations, and we all plan a unique set of stops along the way—or none at all. A single bridge for a region clearly can't do the job of moving people where they need and want to go. Though this special issue of *WPA* is devoted to thinking about one particular bridge—one dedicated to integrating second language perspectives and writers into mainstream writing programs—our present institutional contexts and positionings do not allow us to build that bridge yet, even though we strongly agree that all mainstream composition programs need them.

We begin our discussion of second language writers with this metaphor of bridges as a way to explore our institutional history and review current outcomes of what Paul Kei Matsuda terms the "disciplinary division of labor" ("Composition" 700), or the tacit decision of mainstream composition studies and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) to teach separate populations of writing students. At our institution this division has, for the past forty years, provided second language writers with only one heavily-traveled language bridge.

However, as our opening metaphor suggests, since one bridge rarely does the job of moving populations to and from different places along their desired journeys, and since our university has shown us how a lack of bridges can have negative consequences for our second language writers, we have

chosen to act without formal institutional power or resources, while remaining within the boundaries of our own institutional locations. This choice has meant that we could envision and implement certain programs and activities *as long as we stayed within our professional spaces*; it also meant that we have necessarily become creative and resourceful in tapping into our own professional networks across campus in order to build these bridges for our second language writers.

These professional networks emerge from and reach into many spaces on campus; simultaneously, they converge in productive ways. Candace Stewart holds a PhD in rhetoric and composition and is an experienced teacher of native-English speaker (NES) writers; she also holds the position of writing center coordinator at our institution. Before taking the writing center position seven years ago, she was an instructor in the English department, with substantial experience in teaching writing courses at the first-year and junior-year levels. In her position as the writing center coordinator, she is not a member of the English department faculty, although she regularly teaches writing courses as adjunct faculty. However, the writing center's administrative home is the Center for Writing Excellence, a WAC unit overseen by a campus WPA who is also a tenured English department faculty member. While the English department is the decision-making body overseeing first-year writing program curricula, the department works closely with this WAC WPA who has *institutional* oversight of first-year and junior-level writing curricula. As the full-time writing center coordinator with close scholarly and pedagogical ties to the English department, Candace works closely with this campus WPA.

Candace finds that her own WPA work, which is also situated outside an academic department, allows her to administer the writing center in the full theoretical, rhetorical, scholarly, and professional senses of a writing program administrator. Furthermore, the writing center's WAC focus helps her to stay involved in the theoretical trajectories and challenges of rhetoric and composition and of writing program administration, and her close ties to the English department have resulted in productive collaborations. Her institutional power, what there is of it, lies within the boundaries of her writing center location and with professional and personal ties she has made with other academic units. Robert Stewart and Talinn Phillips are graduate students with little formal institutional power at all. Robert, a master's student in our TESOL program, has taught second language writing in the university's English language program. Talinn, a doctoral student in rhetoric and composition, teaches NES writing and has completed a master's degree in our university's TESOL program. Additionally, both have taught ESL and tutored second language writers in our university's writing center.

Our varied perspectives have helped us identify and use the bridges we see and cross in our concern for second language writing instruction. But because the uneven landscape of our current positions does not give us the formal power to build a bridge into the first-year composition course, we have instead chosen to assess and access the power we do have and then act on behalf of second language writers in whatever ways we can. We have had to re-perceive existing programs that might be more productively understood as bridges, and we have had to be realistic about the bridges we *can* build. This situation is certainly less than satisfying at times, but we suspect that other WPAs, after examining their own institutional contexts, might find themselves in comparable situations; territorial, financial, historical, and pedagogical issues often make bridge-building more complicated than any of us first thought. What we have to offer, then, is perhaps more of a heuristic—a way for WPAs to examine their institutions' relationships to second language writers, to assess these writers' number, location, and the strength of existing bridges, and then to channel their administrative energies into building bridges accordingly.

In the following section, we review the broader historical framework of Matsuda's "disciplinary division of labor" (1999), connecting his research to our own local histories, conditions, and consequences. We then address the ways in which current programs can be conceived as productive bridges for our second language writers and can be more fully explored as sites for pedagogical exchanges in the teaching of writing. We end by emphasizing how other bridges can productively emerge through this review, helping us to realize the goal of several differently placed and differently oriented bridges on our campus.

Bridging Institutional Histories

Matsuda's 1999 historical study, "Composition Studies and ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor," suggests that, in the 1960s, mainstream composition studies essentially, though perhaps unintentionally, signed over responsibility for second language writing instruction to TESOL specialists. Matsuda suggests that because TESOL and mainstream composition teachers were becoming professionalized at roughly the same time, TESOL specialists argued that they were better qualified to teach second language writers. Mainstream composition teachers, who typically had no training in second language writing pedagogy, agreed. And so, the institutional labor of teaching writing became divided: teaching and research in mainstream composition studies has predominantly focused on NES writers (even though

second language writers are frequently present in mainstream courses), while teaching and research in second language writing has been predominantly addressed by TESOL specialists.

Matsuda's findings in that 1999 study on these departmental, theoretical, and practical divides align almost perfectly with our institutional history. From interviews with our English language program's founder and current instructors, we have learned that in 1967. Robert Dakin, the director of our newly founded intensive English program, was part of a committee whose purpose was reviewing the state of writing instruction at our university (Dakin). As a PhD with extensive classroom experience and training in both NES and second language writing pedagogy, Dakin was probably the most qualified person on the committee. At that time, we had no WAC program and the director of composition was a new position filled by literature specialists—because there were no other options. It would be fifteen years before we had a faculty member who specialized in rhetoric and composition and even longer before our rhetoric and composition graduate programs were developed (Pytlik). Thus, Dakin, as the new English language program director, was likely the university's sole writing specialist at the time. When the committee had completed its work, its members made a key recommendation at Dakin's urging: Provide separate writing courses taught by TESOL-trained faculty for second language writers (Dakin).

The two programs continue to follow this 1967 recommendation for first-year writing courses: NES writers are taught in the English department, while second language writers are taught by the English language program's faculty, across the street in a separate building that also houses the master's degree for the TESOL program (MA TESOL)—a fact which emphasizes the programs' geographical isolation from each other. Clearly, the 1967 decision put into place the architecture for unintended, but nevertheless influential, administrative, pedagogical, and curricular walls where the first-year writing course is concerned. This decades-old decision has had a range of consequences for our second language students: For the first-year course, second language writers are required to enroll in designated sections that the English language program is only able to offer once or twice a year. The scarcity of class offerings sometimes makes it difficult for students to enroll in the course. However, for their junior-level advanced composition course, second language writers are mainstreamed into writing courses that are taught in the English department by instructors who frequently lack any pedagogical training in second language writing. The curricular goals of these junior-level classes are tied to those of the NES form of the first-year course, not the second language form. While our goal here is not to judge the current situation, we do want to note that this system causes complica-

tions for both the second language writers who must be mainstreamed into their junior-level courses, and for the instructors who are often unprepared to work with this group of writers.

It is important to note that compartmentalization of writing instruction through these types of designated second language writer sections is not categorically harmful to second language writers. Thoughtfully planned and carried out, such courses can be a productive option for many students (Silva, "Examination" 40) and also for the programs that sustain them, as described in George Braine's "Starting ESL Classes in Freshman Writing Programs" (1994). In this article, Braine reviews the scope and range of second language writing instruction and student placement and provides descriptions of three well known options for placing second language writers. They may get placed into "[. . .] those [first-year courses] dominated by native speakers (mainstreaming), those for [NES] basic writers, or those designed especially for ESL students" (22). Braine's argument for separate writing courses within his English department at the University of South Alabama emerges from the complicated effects of mainstreaming for both second language writers and for their teachers, who were not trained to work with second language populations (22–23). The situation was resolved, according to Braine, by creating "special classes in freshman writing for ESL students" (23). That is, the department created sheltered courses run by the English department and taught by instructors who had completed workshops focusing on second language writers. Clearly, the complicated dynamic of second language writers' specific needs combined with untrained instructors encourages some writing programs to establish separate writing courses for their second language writers. Braine's solution creates a different space within composition studies for second language writers: the integration of the second language course into the writing program offers another way of approaching such courses, allowing writing programs to be involved in second language writing courses and pedagogical development.

Good arguments against sustaining separate writing spaces nevertheless exist, and Tony Silva extends the possibilities with an option called "cross cultural composition" in his "An Examination of Writing Program Administrators' Options for the Placement of ESL Students in First Year Writing Classes." Silva describes this option as "first-year writing classes designed to include more or less equal numbers of ESL and NES students. The goal in such arrangements is to meet the instructional needs of both groups, and, as a dividend, to foster crosscultural understanding, communication, and collaboration" (40).[11] This type of course offers a theoretically and pedagogically grounded approach to the complicated dynamic of having NES and second language writers in a single first-year writing section, for teach-

ers have the opportunity to incorporate students' cultural, rhetorical, and linguistic diversity into their courses. But the course also depends on having experienced and well-trained WPAs who have instructional resources—institutional, departmental, pedagogical, and developmental—to make the case for this addition to the writing program and to maintain it.

What if WPAs do not have these resources? How do they choose the most appropriate placement option for second language writers at their institutions? Silva's later work, "On the Ethical Treatment of ESL Writers," illuminates this issue by considering the issue of placement within the broader perspective of what constitutes fair and ethical treatment of second language writers. He argues that "there are four basic ways in which ESL writers need to be respected: they need to be (a) understood, (b) placed in suitable learning contexts, (c) provided with appropriate instruction, and (d) evaluated fairly" (359). Regarding placement, perhaps the best guide, then, is this: second language writers have varied abilities and varied needs, so instructors must treat second language writers ethically by giving them as many placement options as possible within institutional constraints (see also CCCC Committee; Silva, "Examination"; Silva, "Ethical").

We find Silva's work and the "CCCC Statement on Second language writing and Writers" to be valuable tools for evaluating our placement practices; these guidelines show that our institution does not measure up as well as we would like. As instructors, we see that we have divides to bridge on behalf of our student writers. Yet we are not institutionally positioned to be able to increase placement options for our students. Given our situation, we have looked for other places to build bridges. Many such possibilities exist that are not simply "substitutes" for additional placement options, but valuable, even essential, bridges in their own right. These bridges carry the potential for the English Department, MA TESOL program, and English language program to move toward less stringently compartmentalized teacher education, curricula, and programming while examining the best ways to support our second language writers. We begin the next section by addressing what we have reconceived as a pre-existing and highly used bridge: the student writing center. It is a crucial bridge for second language writers in addition to being a site of convergence for the graduate students who both tutor in the writing center and teach/study the teaching of writing in the English or TESOL graduate programs. We then address small steps being taken to identify and build other bridges, so that both current faculty across the curriculum and future writing faculty have a grounding in second language acquisition and writing pedagogy, but with the understanding that these other bridges have been developed out of relationships forged through and in the writing center. The development of these new bridges depend on

the fact that there is already a geographically and academically centered support site working to bridge the multiple academic, cultural, linguistic, pedagogical, and rhetorical divides for our second language writers: our student writing center.

Bridging Many Divides: The Student Writing Center as Campus Convergence

For us, the writing center has been our convergence point, the site of our bridge, as we negotiate the historical divide between TESOL and the English department at our institution. We have come to see the writing center as an intersection between the otherwise divided writing pedagogies at our institution, for both second language writers and for instructors trying to develop teaching and research expertise in second language writing. The writing center provides a third site—a site which, unlike the TESOL or English departments, is *already* cross-disciplinary—for discussion and experimentation in second language writing. At our university, then, we have envisioned and worked toward implementing the idea of the writing center as the one site where second language writing pedagogy and practice is foregrounded; it's the one site where we have the opportunity to help move second language writing out of the disciplinary and institutional margins.

Second language writers currently make up more than 50% of our writing center population; that statistic implies that we must always be alert for useful strategies for working with second language writers. Fortunately, even a brief literature review of second language writers in tandem with writing centers provides substantial resources for implementing productive practices with second language writers. Two of the most recent publications are *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors* (2004), edited by Shanti Bruce and Ben Rafoth, and a special writing-center issue of the *Journal of Second Language Writing* (2004), edited by Jessica Williams and Carol Severino. The Bruce and Rafoth collection covers global issues in working with second language writers (cultural and rhetorical differences), and local or practical issues for provoking and expanding writing center perspectives on second language instruction. The *JSLW* special issue includes a wide range of research, including Williams and Severino's bibliographic essay, which reviews the scope of research on writing centers and second language writers from 1986 to the present, and identifies several new directions in writing center research. Those new research paths include the rethinking of nondirective approaches with second language writers, investigating the dynamics of second language tutorials, and looking for connections between writing center pedagogy and research in second language acquisition (167–9). These two very recent publications point to the crucial nature and identity of the

writing center; in many institutional settings it is a lifeline for second language writers as they make their way across campus into diverse disciplinary settings.

However, Sharon A. Myers's essay is one of the first that utilizes Matsuda's division of labor perspective to articulate the major differences needed in institutional and writing center pedagogies and practices. Matsuda deconstructs the notion "that second language writing can be broken down neatly into a linguistic component and a writing component and that the linguistic problems will disappear after some additional instruction in remedial language courses" (qtd. in Myers 52). These comments by Matsuda were originally directed toward the "professional disjunction" he observed between English department writing specialists and second language writing specialists. Yet his comments encourage a reconsideration of current writing center pedagogy and practices concerning second language writers. We began such a reconsideration in 2001, when our university's writing center built relationships with some of the TESOL department's graduate students. Although these graduate students were not teaching second language students in the TESOL program, they brought second language perspectives into the writing-center conversation. Our process in rethinking these practices emerged in a much more heightened way when Robert joined the writing center staff in 2005. As a writing instructor trained by the English language program, a writing center tutor, and teacher of ESL, Robert's experiences in his second language classroom and his experiences in our writing center prompted our thinking to suggest we amend our philosophies even more.

Robert agrees with Sharon Myers, who notes that writing center personnel tend to see current writing center philosophy, to the extent that the philosophy is constructed around Western notions of rhetorical conventions and the needs of American students, as a philosophy that should work for second language writers as well. This philosophical and rhetorical construct can easily create a tension in this or any center between American writing center theories and practices—theories and practices which have resulted and been adapted from research on writing and experience in writing courses—and second language writers' "desire for sentence-level interventions from their tutors" (Myers 51). While writing center pedagogues have occasionally tried to distance themselves from current composition theory and practice, an intricate theoretical and practical dynamic does exist between writing center pedagogies and practices and composition studies' pedagogies and practices (Hobson 176). And because many writing programs in English departments have long-critiqued current-traditional rhetoric and its accompanying writ-

ing practices, a number of writing centers have followed suit, thus creating pedagogical and theoretical gaps that have consequences for writing center populations who have varying writing needs (Blau and Hall 25).

Fortunately, much recent writing center scholarship has addressed these consequences in the hope that writing center pedagogies might "strike a balance between providing L2 writers with the information and guidance they sorely need and the broadly accepted writing center philosophy that writers should take and maintain ownership of their own texts" (Williams and Severino 166). In either case, whether writing centers align themselves with composition studies' theory and practice or look for ways to manage the diverse populations using the writing center, the relationship between writing center pedagogy and composition pedagogy still exists.

In contrast, such a dynamic has historically been absent between writing centers and TESOL departments, highlighting how very separate the NES writing programs and second language writing programs often are. Little research exists on the relationship between TESOL programs and writing centers, though a recent article in the special issue of *JSLW* mentioned earlier does make a connection between the Department of Applied Linguistics and ESL at Georgia State University and writing center work. Sara Cushing Weigle and Gayle L. Nelson's collaborative essay, "Novice Tutors and Their ESL Tutees: Three Case Studies of Tutor Roles and Perceptions of Tutorial Success," offers the results of a study looking at the difference a tutorial context makes with second language writers. Weigle and Nelson argue for a tutorial context that is neither a peer-tutoring-based campus writing center nor a "curriculum-based tutoring context" (205), but one that, instead, pairs graduate students enrolled in a course called "Issues in Second Language (L2) Writing" with second language writers. While the information included in this essay offers rich possibilities for writing center work, the study is based on tutorial work outside of the campus writing center. Given the limited number of studies involving ESL specialists and linguistics scholars, Williams and Severino call for further and more extended research on second language writers in the writing center. They suggest that "WC professionals should consider collaborating with researchers" in other disciplines, including "linguistics and L2 acquisition" (170), and they cite a handful of studies that point to the possibility of "even closer connections between WC and L2 acquisition research" (169). Such collaborations will depend on local histories and bridges imagined and built at particular institutional locations. In our experience, the writing center's relationship with the English language program has been at best uneven. Sometimes English language program instructors encourage their students to work with the writing center staff, while other instructors prefer that their students work only with the

instructors themselves. In either case, the lack of any substantial relationship between the English language program and the writing center presents yet another divide for second language writers.

Despite the existence of both pedagogical and programmatic gaps, many second language writers continue to use writing centers and to find them a valuable academic support (see Powers and Nelson). Part of a writing center's value comes from its functioning as both a cultural and a rhetorical bridge (Kennedy 32–33) where writing center tutors and administrators can pay more attention to second language writers' needs while those writers move in and out of various culturally- and rhetorically-oriented disciplines. Further, Eric Hobson emphasizes that second language writers continue to frequent writing centers in spite of pedagogically-oriented gaps in practice because

> writing centers most often are not linked exclusively to composition sequences, [therefore] their staff have [sic] opportunities to maintain longer relationships with students and thus engage in more longitudinal writing instruction that is, ideally, more extensive and of a higher order than most instructors can offer within the framework of [finite] writing courses. (177)

Certainly, the potential to maintain such extensive relationships with second language writers is more appealing than a one-quarter or one-semester writing class. The chance to work consistently with a well trained and compassionate tutor can offer second language writers substantial writing support.

We saw indications of these reported phenomena—Myers's gap, Kennedy's cultural-rhetorical emphasis, and Hobson's longitudinal focus—firsthand when Robert began incorporating some of his classroom teaching strategies into his tutoring interactions. Working with the same second language student twice a week for eleven weeks, he reported that the student improved her writing from nearly unreadable prose to high academic English. He surmised[22] that this success emerged from several factors. For example, he insisted that she learn from her own mistakes and from his corrections, thus reducing her mistakes in article usage from twenty or more per page to fewer than five per page (largely because of the number of sessions). He also developed a set of templates for her to use when writing article reviews; these templates outlined rhetorical patterns and conventions she might follow, thereby addressing shifts in cultural and rhetorical differences. Additionally, the student worked very hard, received ample praise from her classroom teacher, and continued support from one tutor. In sum, Robert

believes that a combination of student persistence, intrinsic desire, a long-term relationship, and positive feedback created the sustained network of internal and external support that this writer needed to become successful.

Though Robert's work with this student displays the kind of commitment and focus that writing center administrators always hope for from their staffs, we can see that his approach was in no way a nondirective or hands-off-the-text approach of the type that writing center philosophies have often stressed. He combined an emphasis on reducing surface features that detracted from the student's writing with practice on the kinds of rhetorical patterns and conventions that faculty expect to see in academic writing. In both cases, he had to give clear directions, provide many examples for the student to imitate, and stay focused on the specific writing issues that he felt the two of them could address.

In following this plan, Robert was able to help the student feel successful—and feel successful himself as a tutor—because they both had a clear sense of the issues that were causing problems and because both could see the progress she was making in the technical and conceptual aspects of language learning. After reflecting on his success with this particular student and on our more general writing center experiences with second language writers, we have now given ourselves permission to integrate whatever pedagogical practices and rhetorical strategies we need when working with our second language writers—what Blau and Hall refers to as "guilt-free tutoring" (41). Our previous one-size-fits-all approach was clearly not working, given the array of academic, cultural, linguistic, personal, and rhetorical backgrounds that second language writers brought, and typically bring, with them. Our assumptions about writing theory and practice have had to change according to student needs.

Since change is what we are after, this section reviews and reflects on how best to begin thinking about the role of the writing programs (English, MA TESOL, English language program, and the writing center) in preparing future faculty for working with second language writers. As we consider the effects of the disciplinary division of labor, we often focus more intensely on the material second language writer: the students in our classes and writing centers right now, today, who are being underserved as a result of the disciplinary division of labor. Yet if we focus too intensely on these material second language writers and their immediate needs, then the division will never be bridged, for the work of bridge-building requires many workers on many campuses. The division not only separates second language writers from the writing support they need, but it also prevents future bridge builders from developing the knowledge and expertise required to continue the

effort of bridging the divide. Thus we have not only a division of *labor*, but a division of *laborers*, and we cannot bridge the first divide unless we also bridge the second.

Bridging Toward the Future: Preparing Future Faculty

In his 1998 article, "Situating ESL Writing in a Cross-Disciplinary Context," Paul Matsuda began identifying many of the markers of what he later termed the "disciplinary division of labor"—especially the ways in which division at the departmental level hampers the work of future bridge builders in graduate programs. Matsuda notes that in TESOL/English language programs, the last writing course that the teachers had typically taken was first-year writing (Reid ctd. in Matsuda, "Situating" 103). The writing pedagogy component of their graduate programs was, at best, a combined reading and writing methods course (Palmer ctd. in Matsuda, "Situating," 103). In English departments, he notes that most graduate students received no preparation at all for teaching second language writers (Brown, Meyer, and Enos ctd. in Matsuda, "Situating" 102).

Our university unfortunately also embodies these markers of the divide, as we exactly match the teacher-training profiles Matsuda identifies. While our English department, like many others, has ongoing and rigorous teaching-associate preparation in place, until last year it had never offered these TAs any preparation for teaching second language writers, despite the fact that second language writers must take the advanced composition courses that these TAs often teach. For our purposes, it is also important to note that the vast majority of English faculty has also had neither training nor exposure to teaching second language writers.

This situation improved slightly in 2005, when new TAs took part in an afternoon workshop on second language writing as part of their second quarter pedagogy course. The course was taught by Candace, who invited Talinn into the course to provide the TAs with a conceptual introduction to *how* and *where* mainstream writing and second language writing converge and diverge on our campus and in the larger fields of TESOL and composition studies. Talinn also offered information to help the TAs gain a rudimentary understanding of key principles from second language acquisition and contrastive rhetoric research. While one class period obviously could not provide thorough teaching preparation, at its end, these new teachers gained at least some understanding of the field of second language writing during the first months of their teaching careers. They will graduate from the English department's graduate program with an awareness of what is necessary to teach second language writers and with resources to draw on whenever second language writers are a part of their classrooms.

Across the street in the MA TESOL department, improvements have been made in the preparation that TAs receive to teach second language writing. In the last two years the faculty has moved from covering writing pedagogy in two weeks for all ages, purposes, and skill levels to requiring the combined reading and writing pedagogy course that Palmer's survey described (Palmer ctd. in Matsuda, "Situating," 103). Perhaps these small changes in the English and MA TESOL departments will pique graduate students' interest in second language writing, encouraging them to pursue its teaching more fully and thereby to address another consequence of the existing divide: the lack of second language writing specialists.

Dwight Atkinson, in a 2000 colloquium article on the future of second language writing, argues that second language writing is "dying before our eyes" (Santos et al. 2) because of the scarcity of its members teaching in doctoral degree-granting institutions and therefore the scarcity of experts mentoring new doctoral students. Yet this lack of specialists in doctoral-granting universities is only one manifestation of the broader issue, for second language writing does not yet have "a disciplinary space to discuss the status of ESL writing in the wider context, as well as a way of influencing non-ESL writing specialists in both disciplines" (Matsuda, "Situating" 111). Second language writing instruction is still often embedded in TESOL (e.g. English language) programs and, because it is so tucked away, has yet to make definitive inroads into both compositionists' consciousnesses and composition programs. Thus a second language writing specialist must be conversant in and have more than a working knowledge of three different fields, a goal that even the most enterprising and dedicated graduate student will find difficult to achieve if she is allowed access only to one specialty. Cross-disciplinary work—and engaging our profession's future faculty in that work—is therefore vital to the future of second language writing. Graduate students need a site where they can teach and research; because so few institutions already have structures in place for that, it is essential that writing program administrators help to find or create sites where we can bridge the division of laborers as we bridge the division of labor.

We believe that the writing center is one of these sites. Graduate student instructors from the English, MA TESOL, and English language programs can build their pedagogical expertise, experiment with strategies, and lay the groundwork for their future lives as educators and instructors who have the knowledge-base and practical experience to work with second language writers wherever they go. The writing center has already been a convergence site for Robert and Talinn, and it is a site for building relationships with other instructors across campus. And so we imagine a future in which our graduate instructors find themselves with more options for pedagogical training,

first in and through the writing center, and then in and through the experience they take back to their own departments. The writing center's role as a pedagogically centralized site for second language writers and writing pedagogy is crucial for changing assumptions about second language writers and about second language writing instruction, both now and in the future.

Bridging across the Curriculum: WAC Initiatives and Faculty Development

The value of bridges built across campus for second language writers will always be limited if we have not yet done the hard work of changing the assumptions disciplinary faculty hold towards second language writers. These faculty are frequently unprepared for working with the writing of second language students, and, as we have seen from frantic calls to the writing center, have been frustrated consistently by the situations they encounter in their classrooms with their second language students. Fortunately, because of a growing network of concern emerging from our WAC program and the writing center, we have envisioned another bridge site to work on; we now have embodied theoretical knowledge and practical pedagogical experiences that are useful when reaching out to disciplinary faculty.

Last winter Talinn approached our campus's WAC director about offering a faculty workshop on second language writing. Because our WAC director had been trying to learn more about the writing philosophies and instruction in our institution's English language program, the director was very supportive of the workshop concept and willing to fund it. Talinn, as a representative of the writing center who was equipped with pedagogical knowledge of both second language and NES writing, used her relationships with the MA TESOL department and English language program to approach some of these faculty members about facilitating the workshop along with Talinn. There had been no cross-program discussions of writing pedagogy for a number of years, and the WAC director's perception was that such discussions would be somewhat politically fraught. Talinn therefore approached these particular faculty members primarily on a personal level. She knew of their existing interest and experience in second language writing pedagogy and selected them with the hope that they would be willing to discuss the range of philosophies and pedagogies of writing.

The workshop was attended by more than a dozen faculty members in programs ranging from social work to engineering who learned and developed various strategies for understanding and responding to second language writers. These strategies included identifying patterns of error, articulating different cultures' ideas of textual ownership, and describing the possibilities of contrastive rhetoric (see Casanave). The workshop was structured so

that participants first spent time reflecting on their own experiences with being second language writers (for instance, when taking foreign-language courses in high school or college) and then on their experiences as teachers of second language writers. Later, the participants interviewed several second language graduate writers to learn more about the unique challenges the students faced in developing their writing abilities in a second language. All of these students were successful writers and international students with different first-language backgrounds.

During the final portion of the workshop, participants developed strategies for teaching second language writers more effectively based on everything they had heard, learned, and discovered that day. In a brainstorming session, participants offered ideas for addressing a number of second language writing issues, including improving students' vocabularies (e.g., suggest a discipline-specific dictionary to teach students related terms; teach specific collocations; use closed captioning on the TV), strengthening organizational structure (e.g., ask writers to outline "in reverse" as a means of identifying organizational problems, offer feedback on early drafts, provide model papers and rubrics), and increasing students' access to (and the number of) institutional resources (e.g. advocate by asking university administration to fund graduate writing courses, form a voluntary buddy system among students for writing support). Faculty, we discovered that day, were excited to have a forum to discuss second language writing and were eager to implement the ideas from the workshop. Furthermore, the core of advocates for second language writers and for the institutional resources to support them has now doubled.

Not only was this the first time our university had offered a WAC faculty-development seminar specifically devoted to second language writing, but it was also the first time in forty years that people from across the TESOL/English divide have worked together to improve second language writing instruction on our campus. As we had hoped, as a result of the workshop, other disciplinary faculty members now seem more interested in and committed to improving the institution's environment for second language writers. We now also have a bridge that links the WAC program, the English department, and the writing center directly with the TESOL department and the English language program—even if only a rope bridge. We are excited because the collaboration is continuing, with copresenters working together on conference presentations and planning to develop another workshop.

As exciting as this workshop was and as excited as we are about the possibilities for more of these experiences, we want to emphasize that the workshop would not have been a possibility if our university had not already

had an established and thriving WAC-based writing center. All the faculty workshops in the world could not, on their own, address the varying levels of writing competencies among the large numbers of second language writers on our campus; the writing-center context for the workshop was crucial. This workshop emerged from an atmosphere of support for second language writers that has been building over the last several years. During these years, through her work in the writing center, Candace formed relationships with faculty in several departments, including the College of Education, the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, the School of Telecommunications, and our Center for International Studies, where the second language populations are fairly large and the support for writers is necessarily crucial.

Because the writing center is already well known on campus as a central resource for working with second language writers, faculty and staff frequently call the writing center asking for help with individual students, ordering materials and information for their students, and requesting presentations and workshops to be provided in their courses. We have developed workshops for second language writers focusing on the writing process, on components of particular genres such as summary and analysis, and on American rhetorical patterns and expectations for academic writing because we have seen those expectations surface consistently in the writing assignments brought to the writing center. In all this, it is important for us to remember that none of these situations—faculty workshops, the writing center as second language resource, or movement toward developing more substantial conversations campus-wide about second language writing instruction—exists in a vacuum, and that they are already participating in a reciprocal dynamic, one that provides energy for creating space for and implementing change.

Two- (or more) Lane Bridges

We have suggested here that not only do second language writers need bridges at many sites across the university, but that the planning and construction of these bridges depend upon the local context. At the our university, the continuing consequences of the institution's 1967 decision to divide the "labor" of writing instruction, combined with our positions of one nonfaculty administrator and two graduate students, inhibit any immediate construction of a bridge directly into the English department's first-year writing program. So while we continue to be concerned about the ethical treatment of our second language writers across the university (see Silva, "Ethical"), we believe we can be more effective in the present and work toward building better bridges in the future by focusing our current energies

at these three bridge sites across the university. These sites are places of convergence at which the networks and collaborations we have developed individually can come together to generate larger networks and collaborations. Further, we believe that no matter what degree of integration occurs between second language writers and mainstream programs, these writers will always need the support of additional bridges across the curriculum. Any institution's writing center is a vital and solid bridge because it not only supports the second language writers themselves, but serves as another, sometimes better, site where graduate students can study second language writing and work out pedagogical strategies. Finally, in addition to second language writers, the disciplines of composition and TESOL will benefit from the act of preparing new construction workers. Current and future faculty, especially those graduate students who are being educated in issues of second language writing, will then be prepared to bring this perspective into the new contexts they create for teaching, learning, and research.

Notes

1   A more detailed description of how this option actually works is offered in a later article by Matsuda and Silva, "Cross-Cultural Composition: Mediated Integration of U.S. and International Students" (1999).

2   No formal research process was involved.

Works Cited

Blau, Susan, and John Hall. "Guilt-Free Tutoring: Rethinking How We Tutor Non-Native-English-Speaking Students." *Writing Center Journal* 23.1 (2002): 23–44.

Braine, George. "Starting ESL Classes in Freshman Writing Programs." *TESOL Journal* 3.4 (1994): 22–25.

Bruce, Shanti, and Ben Rafoth. *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutors*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2004.

Casanave, Christine Pearson. *Controversies in Second Language Writing: Dilemmas and Decisions in Research and Instruction*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2004.

Dakin, Robert. Telephone interview with Talinn Phillips. 3 June 2004.

Hobson, Eric H. "Writing Center Pedagogy." *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*. Ed. Gary Tate, Amy Rupiper, and Kurt Schick. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001. 165–82.

Kennedy, Barbara L. "Non-native Speakers as Students in First-year Composition Classes with Native Speakers: How Can Writing Tutors Help?" *Writing Center Journal* 13.2 (1993): 27–38.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. "Composition Studies and ESL Writing: A Disciplinary Division of Labor." *College Composition and Communication* 50.4 (1999): 699–721.

———. "Situating ESL Writing in a Cross-Disciplinary Context." *Written Communication* 15.1 (1998): 99–121.

Matsuda, Paul Kei, and Tony Silva. "Cross-Cultural Composition: Mediated Integration of U.S. and International Students." *Composition Studies* 27.1 (1999): 15–30.

Myers, Sharon A. "Reassessing the 'Proofreading Trap': ESL Tutoring and Writing Instruction." *Writing Center Journal* 24.1 (2003): 51–67.

Powers, Judith K., and Jane V. Nelson. "Second Language Writers and the Writing Center: A National Survey of Writing Center Conferencing at Graduate Institutions." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 4.2 (1995): 113–38.

Pytlik, Betty P. Personal interview with Talinn Phillips. 7 June 2004.

Santos, Terry, Dwight Atkinson, Melinda Erickson, Paul Kei Matsuda, and Tony Silva. "On the Future of Second Language Writing: A Colloquium." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 9.1 (2000): 1–20.

Silva, Tony. "An Examination of Writing Program Administrators' Options for the Placement of ESL Students in First Year Writing Classes." *Writing Program Administration* 18.1/2 (1994): 37–43.

———. "On the Ethical Treatment of ESL Writers." *TESOL Quarterly* 31 (1997): 359–63.

Weigle, Sara Cushing, and Gayle L. Nelson. "Novice Tutors and Their ESL Tutees: Three Case Studies of Tutor Roles and Perceptions of Tutorial Success." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13.3 (2004): 203–25.

Williams, Jessica, and Carol Severino. "The Writing Center and Second Language Writers." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13.3 (2004): 165–72.

———, eds. *Second Language Writers in the Writing Center.* Spec. issue of *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13.3 (2004): 165–242.

W P
A