The WAC-driven Writing Center: The Future of Writing Instruction in Australasia?

Susan Thomas, The University of Sydney

Abstract: While a national agenda seeks to make Australian higher education more inclusive for an increasingly diverse student population, the contribution that writing instruction can make to achieving these goals has been overlooked. This article outlines the rationale, development, and growth of the Writing Hub at the University of Sydney to advocate for writing center/WAC collaborations as the future of literacy and writing instruction in a culture where writing instruction is still largely viewed as product-based and remedial.

> *If thought is internalized public and social talk, then writing is internalized talk made public and social again.* Kenneth Bruffee, 1984

> *And with our knowledge comes responsibility, for writing, yes, but more for writers. And so it is that we singly and we together must own and own up to writing, not as colonists or profiteers, but as stewards.* Doug Hesse, 2005

This is the story of a writing center that housed a writing program that became a writing department that housed a writing center – and then didn't. Well, sort of. The complicated history of the Writing Hub at the University of Sydney and its various twists and turns have left me contemplating anew the future of writing instruction in the Antipodes.

In his 2005 CCCC Chair's address "Who Owns Writing?," Doug Hesse juxtaposes the terms "responsibility" and "ownership" to demonstrate that this is not a question of claiming intellectual property but rather one of determining "the conditions under which writing is taught" (p. 337). As to who should serve as "stewards" of the discipline, Hesse argues that compositionists, who are knowledgeable about "the whole of" writing, are responsible for writing and writers (355). However, in my experience as the sole compositionist at an Australian "sandstone" (comparable to a U.S. "ivy league"), it is evident that this responsibility must be shared by a variety of stakeholders, lest "stewards" be perceived as "colonists," as Hesse warns. This is particularly true in a British institutional model, with no general education sequence or "core" writing requirement, and where English departments teach mainly literature. In such an environment, writing centers and WAC programs (preferably working together) are far better placed than individual departments to share institutional responsibility for writing and writers.

But beyond questions of who owns writing or who should be responsible for writing instruction, I am more concerned with how writing in Australian universities can shake its remedial stigma and be accepted as a discipline unto itself.

While my theoretical convictions have, admittedly, been shaped by my North American training in rhetoric and composition, my pedagogical and administrative choices as a WPA, Writing Center Director, and de facto WAC coordinator have been influenced every bit as much by what I have learned on the job through my exposure to diverse disciplinary cultures, theories, and approaches to writing instruction. Steering clear of the "advice narrative" that Caswell, McKinney, and Jackson (2016) warn against, this article makes no attempt to convince others to adopt a particular institutional model or theoretical framework for a writing center or WAC program. Rather, it offers the development and history of the Writing Hub at the University of Sydney as but one example of the significant potential of writing centers, in conjunction with WAC, to transform outdated writing cultures and promote writing as a discipline (WaD) as a 21st century alternative to writing as a remedial, product-focused enterprise.

Background

Fifteen years ago, I embarked on carving out a dedicated space for both writing (a writing program) and writers (a writing center) in the English Department at the University of Sydney, Australia. While my gut instinct as a newly-minted, overly-anxious WPA had been to transplant in Australia the U.S. writing instruction model I was familiar with (a rookie mistake, in hindsight), it became clear quickly that this would never work. And as I'd contemplated what would, drawing natural comparisons between North American and Australian approaches to writing instruction, I was confronted by how much I had taken for granted as a U.S.-trained practitioner: a degree structure featuring a writing requirement; a national *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* (2011); professional organizations in writing and rhetoric offering a range of conferences and professional development opportunities for faculty; local discipline peers; and institutional recognition and funding allocations (however meagre) for writing instruction and WAC programs. This rich culture of writing instruction offers at least some recourse for surmounting the time-honored challenges of writing program administration (McLeod, 2007; McClure, 2017; Malenczyk, 2016; C. Charlton, J. Charlton, Graban, Ryan, & Stolley, 2011). But with none of these traditions present in Australia, even in an English Department, it was clear that a successful Sydney writing program would be a grassroots movement, considering the University's educational traditions and aspirations, its unique geographical and cultural context, and – perhaps most importantly, its institutional mission – to help determine its local identity as well as its institutional home.

My arrival at the University of Sydney had coincided with the global turn in rhetoric and composition, yet locally, perceptions of writing remained largely tradition-bound, with senior colleagues in English rejecting my radical ideas on the grounds that they contravened "the way things had always been done" – and that it wasn't the business of the University to teach writing. Many of those opposed were second generation Sydney graduates who had completed their undergraduate and graduate degrees at Sydney and begun their careers as TAs and RAs at Sydney before taking up continuing positions where they would spend the majority, if not the entirety, of their careers. Given their deep personal investment in the institution, my proposal was anathema not only to deep-seated ideologies, but also time-honored, almost sacred traditions. But as Joseph Janangelo writes in *A Critical Look at Institutional Mission: A Guide for Writing Program Administrators* (2016), "excessive evocation of past traditions can make an institution appear to be about the then and there rather than the here and now."

When I joined the University of Sydney as a Lecturer (Assistant Professor) in English in 2004, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences had offered two "writing" courses for undergraduates: ENGL1000: University English, administered by the English Department, approved initially as a non-accredited grammar course that I had been hired to redevelop, and LNGS 1005 Structure of English, a language acquisition course administered by the Linguistics Department. While neither ENGL1000 nor LNGS1005 was mandatory for first-year students, ENGL1000 was advertised as appropriate for "mainstream" students and LNGS1005 for "NESB" (Non-English Speaking Background) students. Students seeking writing assistance (mostly international students) were referred to one of the two courses based on their International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score alone, with LNGS1005 comprising mostly non-native speakers of English and ENGL1000 attracting mostly native speakers. Beyond these two courses, more informal support for students was available through the University Learning Center, with a history of supporting students' study skills needs. However, the Learning Center did not (and still does not) offer individualized peer tutoring or formal semester-long courses – both of which local and international students have indicated on student satisfaction surveys as more useful than short workshops, lectures, or demonstrations supplemented by grammar and style handouts and websites.

A mere two courses intended to address all the writing and language needs of 48,000 culturally and linguistically diverse students at a leading international university was the first sign that a more comprehensive, holistic approach to writing support was needed. In addition to a multi-course writing program, I envisioned a distinct space for a writing center, having learned from my ENGL1000 students that peer review of drafts and participation in collaborative writing exercises could be perceived as cheating or collusion within a normal course context – sentiments that pointed to writing as a product of individual effort rather than a process enriched by collaboration – and to writing instruction as a remedial enterprise, distinct from thinking, and far from the real business of a sandstone. When I suggested to colleagues that a writing center could help improve student writing through peer collaboration, their initial response was, "What's *that*? What would students in such a place *do*?"

Determining Institutional Writing Needs

Finding the balance between Sydney's traditions and aspirations seemed an obvious first step, so I designed and conducted a writing needs analysis, which consisted of a thorough examination of University policies, particularly its Strategic Plan (2011-2015), and a series of faculty interviews and student surveys. My first step would be to reflect on Australia's unique cultural, geographical, and academic heritage to conduct a thorough needs analysis of writing at the University of Sydney. This would involve charting existing writing support structures, as well as eliciting student feedback on their particular writing needs and faculty feedback on their observations and expectations of student writing. The results revealed diverse student and faculty perceptions of writing instruction.

When asked, "Tell us about your experience of writing instruction/support at the University of Sydney," first-year students commented that while ENGL1000 and LNGS1005, as well as short courses at the Learning Center, had been helpful to some degree, they would ideally like to be able to discuss what they were learning (or not) in a more casual and "non-judgmental" environment. Others remarked that the courses and services on offer were too "one-dimensional" and "high-stakes" – "you either get it or you don't," and "you get only one chance in assessments to make a grade." When asked, "What is your opinion of the value of feedback in the writing process?," first-year students commented that they learned the most from informal discussion with peers about the

feedback they had received on their writing assignments, but "by that stage it was too late to use the feedback to improve [their] writing and [their] grade." Nearly all first-year students responded that workshopping a paper through a series of drafts and receiving pre-submission feedback on assignments would be far more useful than the brief cursory comments that normally accompany the final grade. Some of the most interesting responses came from non-English speaking students, who resented having a standardized test (IELTS) determine which class they enrolled in (ENGL1000 or LNGS1005), as these tests do not always present a complete picture of students' abilities. Several international students were confident that they could have succeeded in "mainstream" courses with "just a little extra help" outside the classroom.

In the surveys, I asked students enrolled in ENGL1000, "How do you feel most comfortable asking for help with writing assignments: asking a question in class, emailing or meeting with your teacher, asking a peer/friend/family member, searching online, or some other way?" Almost unanimously, students indicated that they were more comfortable asking peers for help. As one of my more outspoken students put it,

> another student won't judge you if you get it all wrong because they aren't experts either. Professors, though, might remember stupid questions or silly mistakes in class and hold it against you when they're marking your work. Talking to a peer helps you think things through and get dumb ideas out of your system before you embarrass yourself in front of a professor. And sometimes the other person will have questions for you too, so it's a two-way street that you don't get with professors.

On a follow-up survey, I asked the students, "How would you prefer asking a peer for help: in person or via email – and why?" Most replied that they might exchange papers via email in the first instance, but that talking about their concerns in person was usually most helpful. Answering the subsequent "why" question, one student replied,

> Sometimes when I'm talking to someone else about my writing, I end up giving them a different version of what's actually on the page because I'm very careful about what I write, since I want to make sure I get it right, but when I'm talking, the words flow more freely and the person understands what I'm talking about a bit better.

When following up on this question in a subsequent survey, I asked, "Do you go back and revise your writing based on the conversation you've had with a peer?" My favorite response was, "Yes. In some cases, the peer tells me to write what I just told them instead of what's on the paper," as I often receive this advice myself when talking to editors about a draft.

The final question on the final survey was, "What would you think of a place where you could go (free of charge) to talk to a peer about writing assignments – everything from choosing a topic or interpreting a prompt to drafting, editing, revising, and maybe even interpreting feedback?" Responses indicated that most students liked the idea in principle, but seemed skeptical. Some asked, "Wouldn't this be considered cheating?" while others said that showing up to such a place would be "embarrassing" if anyone they knew saw them there. When I asked how getting help from a peer in a writing center would be different from getting help from a peer in another context, one student replied, "because I usually ask a peer for help in private – not in a public place where others can see and possibly hear." In my eagerness to build a writing center, I had overlooked the possibilities of how students who had never encountered a writing center culture might react to the concept, and was unprepared for their unflinchingly honest responses. However, these responses

provided invaluable insight into what was at stake in changing the culture of writing instruction at the University of Sydney.

To combat these negative stereotypes of writing centers and peer review, I began devoting the last half hour of the WRIT1000 seminar to mock "writing center conferences," where students would pair up with their classmates to talk about each other's work without the instructor nearby. I also showed the class videos of writing conferences being conducted in established writing centers. We read articles from *Writing Center Journal* and the *Writing Lab Newsletter* together, and I often discussed the peer review process for academics – and how it is central to our work. Eventually, the students began to view the writing center conference as a source of strength rather than shame, a means of empowerment rather than embarrassment, and the single most effective means at their disposal for improving their writing not just in a single class for a single assignment, but in the writing they do in all contexts.

The surveys and writing center conferences further pointed to students' eagerness to be heard and understood. This research also pointed to faculty's divided opinions, with some welcoming the concept of a writing center and others believing that students should have learned how to write in high school, that it wasn't their (or the university's) job to teach writing. Like their Harvard counterparts a century earlier,[1] Sydney faculty were viewing writing as an objective, product-based exercise rather than what Charles Bazerman (1994) calls a culturally-dependent act, situated within social action. They did not acknowledge that institutional expectations of high school writers are completely different from those of university writers, making it all but impossible for students to learn to write for university audiences before becoming university writers.

Strategic Use of the Strategic Plan

I would find support for my argument of writing as a cultural/social act within the University's own Strategic Plan (2011-2015). Strategies Three, Four, Five, and Thirteen, in particular, seemed relevant for developing an interdisciplinary writing program with a strong focus on global citizenship:

> Strategy Three: Initiate a University-wide program of curriculum renewal.

> Strategy Four: Enrich the experience of University life for all our students.

> Strategy Five: Expand and diversify opportunities for students to develop as global citizens.

> Strategy Thirteen: Prioritise international engagement on a regional basis to support the effective development of University-wide partnerships. (The University of Sydney, 2011)

Since these aims correspond directly with the goals of writing instruction (particularly WAC), as international university enrolments have been steadily increasing (Wildavsky, 2016), and students are writing more than ever in a digital, globalizing world, I could use them to demonstrate how and why the writing center and writing program I envisioned would serve as vehicles for the University's globalization ambitions. But despite this explicit commitment to internationalization pervading the University's Strategic Plan (as per the trend in most contemporary higher education institutions over the last decade) and the proliferation of scholarship on the relationship between internationalization and teaching writing (Horner, Nordquist, & Ryan, 2017; Gannett, 2008; Donahue, 2009) it isn't immediately obvious to institutions without a WaD culture how the

implementation of a writing program (and particularly WAC) can support a diverse, multilingual student population while advancing globalizing aims more organically. And like other "sandstone" institutions, Sydney's traditional reputation as "a finishing school for the elite" hadn't exactly helped the case for WaD. However, since sandstone universities can no longer expect a homogenous, predominantly Australian student population who will have learned to write before attending university, they are being prompted to rethink their approaches to literacy education to cater to a new generation of students. But as Donahue (2009) notes, although the terms "internationalization" and "global citizenship" are now ubiquitous in the mission statements of universities around the world, they are usually unaccompanied by clear implementation strategies – or specific examples of how such goals "translate" on the ground, in the communities that represent the day-to-day business of universities. Since writing is a practice that unites all disciplines and since writing centers cater to students from all disciplines, writing centers and WAC programs working together are better placed to achieve meaningful writing outcomes than single-discipline departments. This is especially true in Australian institutions, which present their own set of challenges, including

- a product-based model of writing instruction pervading most universities;
- a British university model without a general education or required writing requirement – hence, no "compositionists";
- autonomous, entrepreneurial, and competitive faculties who resist sacrificing six credit points (and the attached fees) to other departments for writing instruction.

This operational model usually results in individual departments proposing their own "in-house" writing initiatives. While this may seem logical and even WID-like, it can become a complex exercise for a student working across different disciplines, who may encounter up to half a dozen sets of seemingly contradictory advice on academic writing. In the absence of the administrative features of WID, an overarching mission statement, or set of national guidelines addressing the context and practice of writing at university in general, there is no clear distinction between what Hesse (2005) calls an act of "self-discourse" and/or "obliged discourse," – or a discussion of how the two can work together to help students improve their university writing – or more specifically, transfer their writing from high school to university.

A Writing Center/WAC Framework

Writing Centers, however, in conjunction with WAC, can turn these challenges into opportunities and help students bridge the gulf between self-discourses and obliged discourses by offering an interdisciplinary platform to introduce the concepts of writing transfer and writing to learn. Grounded in broader theories of invention and collaboration (Lauer, 2003; Lunsford, 1991; Lunsford & Ede, 2011; LeFevre, 1986; Burke, 1973; Booth, 2004), rhetoric as an enabling discipline (Corbett, 1972), rhetoric as a social construct (Berlin, 1987; Trimbur, 1989), the WPA as activist (Adler-Kassner, 2008; Harrington, et al., 2016), and writing as epistemic (Leff, 1978; Fulkerson, 1979), writing centers are ideally placed to identify shared institutional principles, passions, and interests and negotiate disciplinary, economic, and ideological tensions to conceive of writing as a practice that unites rather than divides (Horner & Tetreault, 2017).

Aiming to harness the natural complementarity between writing centers and WAC, I wanted to establish a framework for writing instruction and writing research in Australia – reflecting local research and teaching excellence, certainly, but also establishing a firm commitment to community outreach, internationalization, and social activism, as Linda Adler-Kassner (2008) and Susanmarie Harrington et al. (2016) advocate. Moreover, in *Peripheral Visions for Writing Centers* (2013), Jackie

McKinney encourages such multi-theoretical approaches to establish an alternative lens for considering writing centers and the work they do. Admonishing writing center directors to move beyond the iconoclastic "grand narrative" of writing center work as service provision to determine what is possible within the boundaries of writing centers, McKinney argues that blind adherence to the "grand narrative" can diminish the theoretical complexity of writing centers, obfuscating the potential for new approaches (and roles) that challenge tradition. Similarly, Ben Rafoth's 2015 International Writing Centers Association conference keynote address "Faces, Factories, and Warhols: A r(Evolutionary) Future for Writing Centers" (2016), underscores the potential of the writing center for internationalization and social activism, admonishing WPAs to see the possibilities rather than the limitations of writing centers in revolutionizing the role of writing centers for the future. He expands on this theme in *Multilingual Writers and Writing Centers* (2015), encouraging writing center directors and peer tutors to become more attuned to both the needs and capabilities of multilingual writers in the globalized university in order to better assist them as well as utilize their expertise in making writing instruction more meaningful for all students.

With no local disciplinary peers or graduate students in the field, I envisioned committed, student-focused faculty and peer tutors from a range of disciplines uniting to create a collaborative and interdisciplinary approach to writing instruction – a Burkean parlor where conversation, collaboration, and invention would flourish, where students could move effortlessly between their classes and the writing center, and where genuine thought and reflection would flow between formal and informal learning spaces, forming a natural bridge between obliged and self-discourses.

Rather than merely *supporting* writing, I wanted the writing center to be *integral* to the work of the University, dedicated to the 21st century writing needs of students and faculty. I wanted the center to look outward as much as inward, as a rich resource for secondary students and teachers, providing leadership for writing in the schools – and developing a strong community engagement profile and globalizing mission, with consulting services for corporations funding support services for low-income schools and community groups. But what would such a place be called, and how could I create a space for it in a university where such a practice seemed, to use Susan McLeod's (1995) term, "foreign"?

Enter the indefatigable Muriel (Mickey) Harris. Over breakfast at Cs, I explained how "centre" in Australia means something quite different – usually research-focused, donor-endowed enterprises with eponymous names purchased at a cost of millions. So, with the lack of said millions taking "centre" off the table, Mickey and I explored several possibilities, including lab and network, which didn't quite capture the local complexity fabric of the Sydney initiative. I said I'd been thinking about "hub" – and Mickey reminded me of the configuration of a tyre – with many spokes radiating from a (Burkean) wheel – circular, constantly in motion, dynamic. And so, the Writing Hub was born. (For more on the "hub" concept, see Shetler, Thomas, Di Lauro, & Miller [2013], and a short promotional video [Thomas, 2013].)

Playing Musical Chairs

To facilitate the development of the Writing Hub, I left the English Department in 2008 to take up a three-year transfer to the (then) Institute for Teaching and Learning, an independent unit serving the entire University, with my substantive position (and tenure) remaining in English. In my role as Teaching Development Coordinator for the Division of Arts, Law, Education and Music, I had access to many different "in-house" approaches to writing across all sixteen faculties of the University. This gave me a better understanding of what a university-wide approach to writing might look like – and who should be involved.

In 2009, I moved back into the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences for the launch of the Writing Hub as part of the (then) Teaching and Learning Network, which I'd helped design. However, the Hub's rapid growth necessitated a move in 2011 to a school base, where it became a program in writing and rhetoric in the School of Literature, Art, and Media (the same school as English). The Writing Hub was the first program of its kind in Australia, administering accredited writing courses and writing support services for students, facilitated by carefully selected Student Writing Fellows (peer tutors), who have completed a rigorous orientation and mentoring program. The Writing Hub also offered professional development and writing workshops for high school teachers and students as well as the corporate community through its consulting services – and a series of public talks entitled "How I Write," featuring prominent members of the academic and corporate communities discussing their craft. The benefactor of a variety of disciplinary influences, including Linguistics, Australian Studies, Communication, and Gender and Cultural Studies, the Hub fostered a confluence of diverse theoretical and pedagogical communities, both inside and outside the academy, representing a departure from the way writing was normally conceived of and taught in Australia. Emphasizing WaD within a rhetorical framework placed a clear focus on invention, writing transfer, writing in the disciplines, and writing to learn – the core aims of WAC.

But, in a higher education environment trending towards managerialism (Connell, 2013; Aspromourgos, 2012), the Writing Hub fell under threat when the writing program became the Department of Writing Studies in 2017. Under a new Chair with a different theoretical perspective, pressure from above to "conform" to a departmental "template," and a major University restructure which saw sixteen faculties (similar to colleges in the American system)condensed into eight, the name "Writing Hub" disappeared altogether, almost overnight, from departmental literature and University and social media websites, replaced with the far more vague "support for coursework" to connote what was formerly known as a writing center. Gone too was the public lecture series, community outreach programs, and corporate consultancy program, which had funded valuable opportunities for staff and students. Despite my enquiries, there was no clear explanation for any of these changes, most of which had been set into motion while I was on a one-year sabbatical in 2016. And despite being the only formally trained compositionist at the University, I was not consulted about any of these rather sudden changes which seemed to contravene written agreements to retain the name "Writing Hub" for the writing center if and when the writing program became a department.

Returning to the contemplation foreshadowed in the introduction, I realized that events had come full circle. The same ideological constraints that had made WaD all but impossible in a literature-centric Department of English in 2004 had threatened the Writing Hub's existence and survival in an evolving Department of Writing Studies, whose mission had drifted away from theories and practices of rhetorical invention towards a program more akin to cultural studies – with the analysis and consumption of writing taking precedence over the production and application of writing and the social and community activism inherent in such practices.

While obviously disappointed, I thought back to where it all began, to the initial needs analysis that had confirmed my conviction for a writing center, yet also exposed the limitations of an academic department as a host for a University-wide writing initiative and writing center. Naïvely, I had believed that both would be safe in a Department of Writing Studies, but individual programs tend to reflect the interests and priorities of their leaders and the prevailing ethos of the institutions they serve. I was the Founding Director of the Writing Hub, a trained compositionist with nearly two decades of experience in administering writing programs and well versed in the theories that undergird them. But, as we have witnessed around the world, leadership in higher education is becoming increasingly determined by political or institutional agendas (Ferriss, 2017) which may

have more influence than the directions of academic expertise. And, as Johnson (2018) and Percy (2018) discuss elsewhere in this issue, institutional agendas related to writing in Australian universities are most commonly framed around remediation, which remains the greatest challenge for establishing WaD.

In the end, the events surrounding the diminishment and re-framing of the Writing Hub, and the lack of consultation with those within it who embody academic expertise, confirmed for me that a freestanding writing center, free of departmental affiliation, in collaboration with a WAC program is the only possibility for a lasting, interdisciplinary approach to writing in an Australasian University. This model would ensure the cultivation of the writing center by many stewards, as Hesse (2005) suggests, under the protection of a

dedicated, multidisciplinary WAC board, with representative faculties and disciplines nominating their own writing fellows to contribute to the shared mission of a true university-wide approach to writing. Fortunately, a new management team comprised of an interim Chair of Department, a new Head of School, and a new Deputy Head of School support this vision and are working with me to reinstate the original Hub programs and outreach activities, and as well as introduce a WAC program, which has already attracted grant funding and cross-disciplinary interest. Building on this renewed momentum, The Writing Hub's student writing fellows (peer tutors) received in August 2019 the University's highest honor for teaching: a Vice Chancellor's Award for Educational Excellence, further validation of the program's value to the University community.

As is often the case in the long and sometimes sad history of independent writing programs (O'Neill, Crow, & Burton, 2002; Everett & Hanganu-Bresch, 2017), sustained advocacy is necessary to ensure that student needs (rather than institutional politics) dictate the Writing Hub's next move. The responsibility or ownership of writing instruction, as Hesse admonishes, demands shared responsibility and careful stewardship from a wide range of stakeholders with diverse writing expertise across disciplines. As for the Writing Hub at the University of Sydney, I am convinced that, with a strong WAC foundation, the center can hold. However, its development – and the conversations – continue . . .

Notes

[1] In 1898, the Committee on Composition and Rhetoric at Harvard University had concluded that:

- It was absurd that the college, the institution of higher education, should be called upon to turn aside from its proper functions, and devote its means and the time of its instructors to the task of imparting elementary instruction which should be given even in ordinary grammar schools.

- Preparatory schools were to blame for student inadequacies, since schools trained their students to pass certain entrance exams and nothing more.

- Preparatory schools should devote more time to English studies, specifically to English composition.

- Admissions requirements should be raised immediately to a point where lower schools would be forced to take the matter in hand or see most of their graduates barred from admission to Harvard. (Kitzhaber, 1990, pp. 40-45)

References

Adler-Kassner, Linda. (2008). *The activist WPA: Changing stories about writing and writers*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Aspromourgos, Tony. (2012). The managerialist university: An economic interpretation. *Australian Universities' Review*, *54*(2), 44-49.

Bazerman, Charles. (1994). Systems of genre and the enactment of social intentions. In Aviva Freedman & Peter Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the New Rhetoric* (pp. 79-101). London: Taylor and Francis.

Berlin, James. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American colleges, 1900–1989*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Booth, Wayne C. (2004). *The rhetoric of RHETORIC: The quest for effective communication*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Bruffee, Kenneth. (1984). *Peer tutoring and the 'conversation of mankind'*. In Gary A. Olson (Ed.), *Writing centers: Theory and administration*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Burke, Kenneth. (1973). *The philosophy of literary form: Studies in symbolic action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Caswell, Nicole I., McKinney, Jackie G., & Jackson, Rebecca. (Eds.). (2016). *The working lives of new writing center directors*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Charlton, Colin, Charlton, Jonikka, Graban, Tarez Samra, Ryan, Kathleen J., & Stolley, Amy Ferdinandt. (Eds.). (2011). *GenAdmin: Theorizing WPA identities in the twenty-first century*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Connell, Raewyn. (2013). The neoliberal cascade and education: An essay on the market agenda and its consequences. *Critical Studies in Education*, *54*(2), 99-112.

Corbett, Edward P. J. (1972). Rhetoric, the enabling discipline. *Ohio English Bulletin*, (13), 2-10.

Donahue, Tiane. (2009). "Internationalization" and Composition Studies: Reorienting the discourse. *College Composition and Curriculum*, *61*(2), 212-243.

Everett, Justin, & Hanganu-Bresch, Cristina. (Eds.). (2017). *A minefield of dreams: Triumphs and travails of independent writing programs* (Perspectives on writing). Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado. Retrieved from https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/minefield/

Ferriss, Tim. (2017). *Tribe of mentors*. New York: Ebury Publishing.

Framework for success in postsecondary writing. (2011). Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), & National Writing Project (NWP). Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/files/framework-for-success-postsecondary-writing.pdf

Fulkerson, Richard. (1979). Four philosophies of composition. *College Composition and Communication*, *30*(4), 343-348.

Gannett, Cinthia. (2008, April 3). *Proceed with caution: Working with and working on intertrans-cross-national-institutional global-cultural writing research*. Paper presented at the College Conference on Composition and Communication, New Orleans, LA.

Harrington, Susanmarie, Dinitz, Sue, Benner, Rob, Davenport, Laura, Hudson, Bronwen, & Warrender, Kathryn. (2016). Turning stories from the Writing Center into useful knowledge: Writing centers, WID programs, and partnerships for change. In Alice Johnston Myatt & Lynée Lewis Gaillet (Eds.), *Writing programs, collaborations, and partnerships: Transcending boundaries* (pp. 141-160). New York: Palgrave/Macmillan.

Harris, Muriel. (1990). What's up and what's in: Trends and traditions in writing centers. *The Writing Center Journal*, *11*(1), 15-25.

Hesse, Doug. (2005). Who owns writing. *College Composition and Communication*, *57*(2), 335-357.

Horner, Bruce, & Tetreault, Laura. (Eds.). (2017). *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Horner, Bruce, Nordquist, Brice, & Ryan, Susan M. (Eds.). (2017). *Economies of writing: Revaluations in rhetoric and composition.* Logan: Utah State UP.

Janangelo, Joseph. (Ed.). (2016). *A critical look at institutional mission: A guide for writing program administrators*. Anderson: Parlor Press.

Johnson, Andrew. (2018). On the borderline: Writing about writing, threshold concepts of writing, and credit-bearing academic writing subjects in Australia. *Across the Disciplines*.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. (1990). *Rhetoric in American colleges, 1850-1900*. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press.

Lauer, Janice. (2003). *Invention in rhetoric and composition*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

LeFevre, Karen Burke. (1986). *Invention as a social act*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Leff, Michael C. (1978). In search of Ariadne's thread: A review of the recent literature on rhetorical theory. *Central States Speech Journal*, *29*(2), 3-91.

Lunsford, Andrea A. (1991). Collaboration, control, and the idea of a writing center. *The Writing Center Journal*, *12*(1), 3-10.

Lunsford, Andrea, & Ede, Lisa. (2011). *Writing together: Collaboration in theory and practice*. New York: Bedford St. Martin's.

Malenczyk, Rita. (Ed.). (2016). *A rhetoric for writing program administrators*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

McClure, Randall. (2017). An army of one: The possibilities and pitfalls of WPA work for the lone compositionist. In Theresa Enos & John Borrowman (Eds.), *The promise and perils of writing program administration*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

McKinney, Jackie G. (2013). *Peripheral visions for writing centers*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

McLeod, Susan. (1995). The foreigner: WAC directors as agents of change. In Joseph Janangelo & Kristine Hansen (Eds.). *Resituating writing: Constructing and administering writing programs* (pp. 108-116). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

McLeod, Susan. (Ed.). (2007). *Writing program administration*. West Lafayette, Ind: The WAC Clearinghouse.

O'Neill, Peggy, Crow, Angela, & Burton, Larry W. (Eds.) (2002). A field of dreams: Independent writing programs and the future of composition studies. *All USU Press Publications* (Book 135). Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/usupress_pubs/135

Percy, Alisa. (2018). From the margins to the centre: Reflections on the "past-present-future" of literacy education in the academy. *Across the Disciplines*.

Rafoth, Ben. (2015). *Multilingual writers and writing centers*. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Rafoth, Ben. (2016). Faces, factories, and Warhols: A r(Evolutionary) future for writing centers. *The Writing Center Journal*, *35*(2), 17-32.

Shetler, Angela, Thomas, Susan, Di Lauro, Frances, & Miller, Benjamin. (2013). Multimodal writing instruction in a global world. *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, *17*(3). Retrieved from http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/17.3/praxis/shetler-et-al/index.html

The University of Sydney. (2011). *The University of Sydney Strategic Plan, 2011-2015*. Retrieved from https://sydney.edu.au/content/dam/corporate/documents/about-us/values-and-visions/strategic_plan_2011-2015.pdf

Thomas, Susan E. (2013). Introducing the University of Sydney Writing Hub. [Praxis]. *Kairos*, *17*(3). Sydney: The University of Sydney Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YjupJWPI7DU

Trimbur, John. (1989). Consensus and difference in collaborative learning. *College English*, *51*(6), 602-622.

Wildavsky, Brian. (2016). *The great brain race: How global universities are reshaping the world*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Contact Information

Susan Thomas, Associate Professor
The University of Sydney
NSW 2006
Australia
Email: Susan.thomas@sydney.edu.au

Complete APA Citation

Thomas, Susan. (2019, October 5). The WAC-driven writing center: The future of writing instruction in Australasia? [Special issue on writing across the curriculum in Australia and New Zealand.] *Across the Disciplines, 16*(3), 80-90. Retrieved from http://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/australasia/thomas2019.pdf