

# 9

## Hybrid Writing Positions within WAC/WID Initiatives: Connecting Faculty Writing Expectations and MENA Cultures

Amy Hodges

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY (QATAR)

Brenda Kent

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY (QATAR)

Writing-intensive courses for engineers at Texas A&M University at Qatar provide a unique view into the efficacy of writing-in-the-disciplines (WID) policies and practices in the Middle East. In this chapter, the authors draw upon qualitative data from faculty interviews to examine their perceptions surrounding the teaching and learning of writing. The authors argue that hybrid writing consultants—staff positions with the combined roles of tutor, teacher, and writing fellow—are a locally relevant way to help mediate between engineering faculty members' expectations and multilingual students' development as writers.

Keywords: WAC/WID; writing support; multilingual writers; engineering; international branch campus

After being invited to open an international branch campus (IBC) by the Qatar Foundation, the Texas A&M University at Qatar (TAM-Q) undergraduate engineering programs began admitting students in 2003. TAM-Q students major in one of four areas of engineering: petroleum, mechanical, chemical, or electrical and computer engineering. They take the same courses and meet the same requirements as students in the engineering department on the main campus, and, as the main campus writing-across-the-curriculum (WAC)/*writing-in-the-disciplines* (WID) initiatives transferred as well, their course load includes writing-intensive (WI) courses. Although not an uncommon sight in the Arabian Gulf region today, most IBCs in the area have

been operating for fewer than 15 years. In 2011, Miller-Idriss and Hanauer classified over half—34 out of 57—of “transnational” universities in the Middle East as IBCs like ours (p. 183). They also observed that a majority of these IBCs provided degrees in technical and professional fields, such as business, information technology, and engineering (Miller-Idriss & Hanauer, 2011, p. 188). In addition to adding new options for tertiary education, as Miller-Idriss and Hanauer (2011) have noted, IBCs have spearheaded a larger shift in technical education in the Gulf “away from rote learning and fixed curricula toward an emphasis on learning-by-doing and on-the-job learning” (p. 193). (See Miller & Pessoa, this volume, for extensive description on IBCs; see also Telafici & Rudd, this volume, for further IBC challenges.)

Although the curriculum and degree are exactly the same as our home campus in the US, almost all of our students at our IBC are multilingual; around half are Qatari, and the rest are from other areas in the MENA region and Southeast Asia. As such, not only do our students have to become familiar with the discourse of western academic English (and, in some cases, while they are still acquiring aspects of everyday spoken and written English), they are also adopting the secondary discourse of writing as an engineer.

Our engineering faculty members are expatriate residents (not citizens) of Qatar, and most have terminal degrees from the US, Canada, or UK. Several are fluent in Arabic—although not always the local Qatari dialect—but others are not; for all, the bulk of their academic and industry work is conducted in English. Further discussion of our interview population can be found in the methodology section, but for now it is worth observing that our engineering faculty members tend to have two significant commonalities in addition to their disciplinary knowledge: they have achieved success—an undergraduate or terminal degree—in a western educational institution, and much of their national, ethnic, and cultural background is not shared with over half of their students. Thus, our IBC is a complicated location where, on the one hand, power differences between expatriate faculty and local students can resemble a kind of cultural imperialism (Tomlinson, 1991), and, on the other, the institution provides our students with a space to “reconstruct their languages, cultures, and identities to their advantage” (Canagarajah, 1999, p. 2). In this context, we want to consider how a WAC/WID initiative with a WI course requirement impacts the relationship between MENA cultures and disciplinary writing in the English language.

We are sensitive to the perception voiced by critics such as Altbach (2004), that the combined forces of globalization and higher education result in “the loss of intellectual and cultural autonomy by those who are less powerful” (p. 9). Others have written about IBCs’ complicated sociopolitical effects on

Gulf Arab educational institutions (Witte, 2010) and indigenous forms and conditions of knowledge-making (Donn & Al Manthri, 2010). These broader questions about transnational education inform how we understand the relationships between faculty and students in our institution's classrooms, and in particular, how we interpret faculty and student perceptions of WI courses. Previous research has suggested that students in the Gulf region view western education and the English language with a "simultaneously imitative and resistant" attitude (Findlow, 2006, p. 31; see also O'Neill, 2014). Primary and secondary education in the Gulf and wider MENA region has been criticized in western scholarship for its emphasis on rote learning, where "the book itself acts as the sole source of information" (Heyneman, 1997, p. 452; see also Steer, Ghanem, & Jalbout, 2014, for statistics on student retention in the MENA region). Others have indicated that MENA students "are not used to interrogating texts and are not familiar with the western convention of writing with the audience in mind" (Golkowska, 2013, p. 340) and "are graduating [secondary school] without the basic skills needed to succeed at the university level" (Borger, 2007, para. 1). If these descriptions of the region's student population are true, we decided that it would be worthwhile to explore how our faculty members perceive their roles in a transnational WAC/WID initiative. Their experiences of both broadening access to and serving as gatekeepers of disciplinary writing would help us decide how to support the work done in engineering courses.

Our experiences at our IBC, particularly one of the co-author Kent's experience as a writing consultant for an Ethics and Engineering course, led us to raise an important question for other IBCs and institutions with diverse student bodies: How do engineering faculty members perceive the roles of writing and the teaching of writing in their engineering courses that serve a predominantly multilingual student population? To answer this question, this chapter examines qualitative data from IRB-approved interviews conducted with engineering faculty members who taught writing-intensive (WI) courses at our university. In our analysis, we reflect on themes that emerged from the interviews, and we conclude by arguing for the efficacy of hybrid writing positions, like the one held by Kent, who works to fill gaps between faculty expectations and multilingual students' development as writers.

## Writing as an Engineer and WAC/WID Initiatives

Winsor's (1990) research introduced the idea of working engineers "writing themselves as engineers," that is, using writing both to generate knowledge and establish themselves as members of the professional engineering world

(p. 66). This complex understanding of writing, rhetoric, and identity can be difficult for engineering students to comprehend and apply to their WI courses. Leydens (2008) has suggested that the integration of writing identities and engineering identities, as well as an understanding of rhetoric as an important part of engineering practice, may not develop in engineering students until after graduation and more on-the-job experience.

Studies have shown that engineers on the job appreciate and seek out peer review and constructive feedback on their writing (Steiner, 2011), and that they find writing engaging when they “know their texts will be acted upon by others in the development of the design,” or, in other words, when engineers write for real, active audiences (Sales, 2009, p. 90). Winsor’s 1996 book, *Writing Like an Engineer: A Rhetorical Education*, advocates for an adjustment in the way that workplace writing courses teach audience by highlighting the ways in which engineers see writing as a social activity, a perspective echoed in the requirements from the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). ABET educational objectives stress students’ ability to identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems in writing; to function on multidisciplinary teams and to communicate effectively with team members; and to engage with knowledge of contemporary issues in engineering. These requirements for accreditation and the research on the engineering workplace have been helpful justification for writing-intensive courses, but such courses can involve teaching technical and workplace communication in ways that are new or uncomfortable for engineering educators and writing specialists (Leydens, 2012).

In this chapter, we examine these issues from our particular positions in our IBC. Co-author Brenda Kent, a staff member supporting an Ethics and Engineering course described later in this section, collaborated with co-author Amy Hodges, an instructional assistant professor with a background in writing centers, to investigate what engineering faculty members think about the teaching of writing in their engineering courses and to consider what our university could do to better support faculty and students. We wanted to know about “flaws in our assumptions about the universality of writing programs” (Anson & Donahue, 2015, p. 33) and consider the context of our students’ previous and current literacy learning.

Kent’s position as writing consultant was created to serve one WI course required of all engineering students at our IBC. Ethics and Engineering is co-taught by a professor from an engineering discipline and a professor from a liberal arts discipline. On our home campus in the US, those professors are assisted by graduate student teaching assistants (TAs) who lead discussions and provide feedback on writing assignments. Since our campus mainly serves

undergraduate students, the Ethics and Engineering professors did not have access to TAs and hired Kent in 2010 to supplement their writing instruction and feedback. In interviews, these professors expressed their feelings that, given their “unique situation” with a majority of multilingual students, hiring professional staff members for the role of writing consultant would provide more continuity and a better quality of teaching experience for the students.

Prior to working at our IBC, Kent earned a BA in teaching, taught writing in public and homeschool settings in the US, and worked in business writing and editing. At first, she was hired part-time as a professional tutor in our writing center, and soon her duties shifted to working with only students in the Ethics and Engineering course as a full-time writing specialist. Over the past four years working with this course, her role has encompassed duties held by writing faculty members, teaching assistants, and writing fellows. During the semester, Kent provides lessons on critical reading, organizing, and argumentation, and she guides 50-60 students through peer reviews of all six writing assignments. She estimates that she holds at least 200 tutorials per semester. Kent is not quite what we would traditionally call a TA—she is not working on and does not hold a graduate degree in either engineering or ethics—but neither is she a writing fellow, since she has already completed an undergraduate degree. Instead, she fulfills a hybrid role somewhere in between these models for writing support, coaching students through writing assignments while also taking authority for the teaching of writing within the course.

Neither of the professors who hired Kent had specialized knowledge of WAC/WID initiatives. In the rapidly changing and expanding world of IBCs, Kent had few previous models for her position in the Middle East, much less at an engineering IBC in a similar situation. We were curious about how her hybrid writing position mediated some of the conflicts among writing-intensive course goals, TAM-Q faculty writing expectations and TAM-Q students’ cultural and educational backgrounds.

## Methods

In order to determine what our diverse group of engineering faculty expected from their student writers and what perceptions about disciplinary writing guided their choices as teachers, in the spring semester of 2014 we interviewed 10 current or recent instructors of engineering courses designated as a WI course. In the case of Electrical and Computer Engineering, our recruitment included teaching and lab staff members. The Electrical Engineering WI course is the first half of students’ senior design course series, in which

students complete a major project that is the capstone of their engineering knowledge. Although the lead instructor is a faculty member, we interviewed the lab TAs who had the most frequent and sustained contact with the students' writing. An additional interviewee (Dr. Tareq) was contacted because his sophomore-level course was well known to be writing intensive, even if it did not have the official designation from the university. All of our interviewees are identified by pseudonyms, and more information on their roles at the university can be found in the Appendix.

One interviewee (Dr. Holly) identified as a native English speaker, and the rest identified their mother tongue as other than English. Most had postgraduate degrees from the US and the UK, so they considered their English language skills to be above average for their professional tasks. Two of our ten faculty interviewees (Dr. Holly and Dr. Sharifa) were female, and two male interviewees also served as administrators at the university.

As we conducted our interviews, we came to understand that the number of credit hours assigned to the WI course was an important part of our interviewees' perspective on writing in their courses (see Appendix). Our home campus, and thus our Qatar campus as well, requires two WI courses in the major; although each of our engineering programs required Kent's three credit-hour Ethics and Engineering course, the credit hours of the other WI courses varied. As mentioned above, Electrical and Computer Engineering combined their senior design courses with the WI course requirements, but the other programs did not.

Many of our interviewees were well known to us as friends and members of our small academic community. Thus, our research methodology was informed by the perspective of Selfe and Hawisher (2012), who have viewed interviews "more like conversations that involved participants in a joint project of inquiry" (p. 38). Several of our interviewees were aware that Kent provided writing support, and they were curious about what she did and how their course fit into the larger scheme of WI courses at our IBC. We collected our interview data as a team, approaching our interviews as a "less-structured conversation in which meaning is made, negotiated, and interpreted collaboratively" (p. 45). Thus, our semi-structured interviews included some of the following questions, but we also allowed the conversation to flow and fit the narrative that the interviewee wanted to tell about his or her course.

- What kinds of writing do you do professionally? What kinds of writing are you training your students for?
- How often (in class hours per week or class periods per semester) do you spend in class on writing instruction?

- How much time per week or per semester would you estimate that you spend preparing lessons on writing? Consulting with students on writing? Grading or evaluating writing?
- What assignments do you give? How did you develop these assignments?
- How do you evaluate the students' writing? How did you come up with this method?

These interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes each. Additionally, we collected relevant documents from our interviewees, such as syllabus materials, assignment prompts, and sample student writing. These documents helped us understand the context of our interviewees' perceptions of teaching disciplinary writing.

After transcribing these interviews, we coded them according to theme (Merriam, 2009). The following sections describe some of our major themes and point to our initial findings about the role of writing support in WAC/WID programs in the MENA region. This is a small study in a specific context, but some findings may be transferable to other contexts, including other IBCs in technical fields and universities with significant numbers of students from the MENA region.

## Results

### WI Requirement: Faculty Attitudes and Student Reactions

Professors reported a wide variety of assigned writing in their courses, including lab reports, technical reports, resumes, reflective writing, film reviews, informative reports, memos, proposals, literature reviews, market surveys, progress reports, argument-driven academic essays, and several different kinds of presentations, both in class and on video. Most interviewees, particularly those who taught one-credit-hour WI courses, expressed concern that the amount of writing weighed heavily on their students' already challenging course load. Dr. Sharifa reported that her students "always complain every end of semester . . . 'too much work, too much work for a one credit course.' And it is too much work." Dr. Holly told her students on the first day of class, "Look, I am going to tell you right now. I can't do anything about this. This is a university requirement. You need to do this." The perception that the standards and expectations for the course were high placed the instructors in a defensive mode; Dr. Tareq, for instance, felt like he needed to justify his writing assignments: "I am not asking them to write a lot. I am asking them to write enough, but to them it is very, very much."



Even as the professors reported large amounts of writing and high standards for their courses, they did not think that many of the students met their expectations. Dr. Burhan summed up the perspective of many of our interviewees: “We have been surprised and we have been disappointed quite frequently.” While all of the faculty and staff members saw the value of the skills, practices, and products they were teaching, few were comfortable with how well their knowledge about writing as an engineer was being transmitted to the students. Dr. Sharifa was disappointed in one of her classes, saying that they were “smart but they did not put any effort in the lab. . . . They totally neglected [the lab reports] for the other courses, so they would hand in their reports late. They would give it in a sloppy way. You could tell that they [didn’t] care.” Dr. Rahmat saw a “big gap. The basic[s of writing] are not really good. They have difficulty to write.” Several traced this disconnect to the students’ heavy workload—did they really have time to complete all of the requirements of a WI course while working on their other engineering courses?—but others thought that the students’ educational background played a significant role. As the instructor of a required WI course connecting issues in the humanities and in engineering, Dr. Burhan felt that the students “did not have any training in humanities, so we had to take a few steps back and start where one would start at grade 7” in the US or another western educational system.

We can identify in these responses a frustration voiced in departmental meetings around the world, as Dr. Burhan phrased it: “we have tried our best to bring the horse to the water.” Even as professors validated the relevance and importance of WI courses, they struggled to reconcile their expectations for the students and the students’ performance on their writing assignments. On the one hand, they saw themselves and their students as powerless before the abstract expectations of the university system and the engineering discipline at large, but on the other hand, they positioned themselves as the standard-bearers and gatekeepers of student writing expertise and work ethic.

### Professional Identity and Definitions of Writing

Overwhelmingly, our interviewees, like many of their counterparts elsewhere, viewed “writing” in terms of surface features of student texts, such as grammatical and mechanical usage, formatting, use of technical vocabulary, and labeling of figures and tables. Mr. Samir explained that “the first stuff they submit is usually disastrous. . . . They don’t put page numbering. They don’t number their sections. Fonts are chosen randomly and are not consistent with the whole report. They don’t number figures.” Dr. Holly told us that she has



students who “don’t know when to capitalize, when to end a sentence and start a new one. This is simple.” In his lectures on writing, Dr. Tareq said that he taught about some of the common mistakes that “students are making grammar wise . . . affect and effect, like this. . . . I assume these are the common things that they learn in their English courses anyway.” On the one hand, we were impressed by faculty members’ willingness to closely critique students’ work and provide substantial feedback. On the other, we wondered what role they saw writing support staff members playing other than a grammatical fix-it service.

Moreover, the interviewees often considered “writing” to be disconnected from the “technical” or content features of texts, also not an uncommon view among disciplinary faculty. Mr. Ahmed felt like his job “is not to check on their English writing. The intention here is to look on the technical material. It is not on how they are writing English, [or] is the grammar correct. Sometimes, if we find something misspelled, we underline that, but the intention here is the technical part.” Dr. Sharifa told us that she mostly grades the “technical point of view and the format.” Dr. Burhan felt that teaching a writing-intensive course in his field was “almost like teaching two courses at one time. . . . So they may write a beautiful sentence, but it makes no sense in ethical terms.” Dr. Holly, who reported spending time in her office instructing students on the finer points of sentence boundaries, questioned how to evaluate student writing with her knowledge of engineering: “It could have been great sort of content-wise, but really awful grammar. How do I grade that? What do I do?” Dr. Rahmat wondered why his students misspelled words because the “simple things [writing] are supposed to be straight from the beginning.”

This view of writing informed their identities as professors and teachers, as several of our interviewees told us they “[didn’t] know how to teach writing, and . . . how to teach grammar,” or that they “don’t teach them English or that sort of thing.” Dr. Miraj felt that faculty resistance to integrating writing in their courses was caused by a lack of training:

[Engineering professors] resist to do it because they are not trained to do it. They don’t see it as their job to do it, and maybe they don’t appreciate how important it is. . . . Some of the professors are brilliant technically, but maybe they never learned professional, technical writing. So how do you expect them to teach it if they were not comfortable with it? They can write very well, but they are not instructing [the students].

Dr. Sharifa also expressed interest in further training in the teaching of writing, explaining that she “would like to have some ammunition. . . . I admit that I am not a perfect writer.” However receptive our interviewees were to more knowledge about *writing* pedagogy, their perception of what is or is not writing concerned us.

Carter (2007) has argued that the perceived divide between writing and the disciplines needs to be bridged by “conceptualiz[ing] writing in the disciplines in a way that is grounded in the disciplines themselves, a viable alternative to an understanding of writing as universally generalizable” (p. 387). By situating disciplinary ways of knowing and writing within metagenres, or similar ways of doing, Carter (2007) places faculty members in the disciplines in a position of authority over writing “on their own turf” (p. 408). Despite the implementation of the home campus’ WAC/WID requirements, our interviewees persisted in separating “technical” aspects of texts from the “writing” of texts; they absolved themselves of responsibility over writing by not worrying about it or leaving it for others to “fix.” Kent’s role was created to fill such a need; overwhelmed by the needs of their multilingual student writers, the professors in charge of the Ethics and Engineering course assigned all of the course duties related to writing to her. Our interviewees were very interested to hear about the services Kent provided to the course’s students and faculty, and many expressed a desire to hire someone to take over the teaching and tutoring of writing in their own courses.

We see these findings as a call to continue to negotiate definitions and practices of writing with our disciplinary faculty and, as we explain in the next section, we feel that hybrid writing positions like Kent’s provide a chance to, in Dr. Miraj’s words, “make the professor like [integrating writing into a course] because it [does] not put him into a stressful place.”

## Discussion

Our interviews showed us that our faculty members in the STEM fields—even those who speak multiple languages and have lived in the same regions of the world as their students—have perspectives that challenge some of the current ideology on teaching discipline-specific writing. These findings add to the rich literature on faculty constructions of their role in a WAC/WID program with a significant L2 population (Ives, Leahy, Leming, Pierce, & Schwartz, 2014; Zawacki & Habib, 2014). Much like other disciplinary faculty members depicted in the research, our interviewees expressed views along a spectrum that encompasses both engaged, passionate teaching and careful (although occasionally problematic) attention to surface-level features of

texts. They illustrate the “gap between faculty fantasies about writing and the reality of students struggling to make sense of academic literacy” (Carroll, 2012, p. 8). Further ethnographic research might help us understand how the sociopolitical context of the Arab Gulf region has impacted these stances.

However, we wanted to use these interviews as “mirrors for our own perspectives and belief systems, and thus help us examine more critically what we ourselves think and do, both within our own classrooms and with respect to the larger institutional contexts in which we teach” (Zamel, 1995, p. 507). While these findings might reflect universal faculty perceptions, our response had to consider the context of an engineering IBC in Qatar. Given what we knew from these interviews, how might we work towards mediating faculty expectations for student writing and also promoting writing pedagogy that would be beneficial to our multilingual student population?

As might be expected, we found in the interviews various constructions of a writing teacher’s role. Some faculty members took on this role themselves through direct instruction in one-on-one conferences with students, but all implied or stated that a writing teacher would use more authoritative methods to pass on knowledge; in some instances, faculty reported giving lectures on writing or asking others to come in and instruct students on grammatical or mechanical norms. Kent’s status as a teacher-figure in the Ethics and Engineering course addressed faculty members’ desire for direct teaching of western academic and professional writing conventions, and many of her one-on-one consultations helped students understand the grammatical and mechanical expectations of their instructors. Because of their previous educational experience in the MENA region, TAM-Q students tend to be familiar with a more teacher-centered learning environment than those in the US. Canagarajah (1999) has questioned writing pedagogy and institutional structures for assuming that learning styles translate across cultures, as for some students, “it seems likely that they would prefer a more formal, product-oriented, teacher-centered pedagogy, of the sort now denigrated by center professional circles” (p. 14). Our experience observing local secondary school classes has suggested to us that this is also the case for many of our students. In this light, we argue that Kent’s course meetings, which cover critical reading, organizing, and argumentation strategies, mediate faculty expectations that a writing teacher will act as an authority and student expectations formed from their previous experience with other teachers in the MENA region.

The other issue we reflected on after completing the interviews was how our faculty members conceptualized the role of a writer. Even though faculty were often published writers in their own discipline, they did not often po-

sition themselves as writers to their students and saw writing as something different from technical work. Kent's hybrid role—somewhere in between a teaching assistant and a writing fellow—complicated this binary. As both an outsider to the engineering discipline and, because of her years of experience with one class, a growing expertise in issues related to ethics and engineering, Kent blurred the boundaries of the technical/writing divide that faculty perceived as important. Her use of peer reviews and other indirect methods of teaching promoted a different view of writers—one that is less authority-based and more democratic. The teaching part of Kent's role helped our initiative adapt to faculty expectations and pedagogical methods that students were familiar with, and the tutoring part of her role pushed both parties towards understanding new ways of learning. As we work towards LeCourt's (2012) vision of a critical WAC program, one that "redefines thinking and learning through writing in terms that recognize the viability of the students' discourses as much as the disciplinary ones" (p. 82), hybrid positions like Kent's provide a promising way to bring disciplinary faculty and students into conversation over how to develop expertise as a writer and an engineer.

### The Potential for Hybrid Writing Positions in the MENA Region

We recognize that others, in the Gulf region and out of it, see similar attitudes in their faculty members, and perhaps, even see some of themselves in the interviews analyzed in this chapter. We also recognize that our perceived acquiescence to some of these attitudes may strike some of our readers as problematic—after all, shouldn't we correct some of these statements and implement more WAC/WID programming that forces disciplinary faculty to meet us on our own terms, the terms of mainstream western writing pedagogy? At our IBC, we have taken the advice of Lyon (2009) to heart: "While overseas teachers may nod to the community values inherent in . . . local pedagogies, *true understanding requires risking their own foundations*" (p. 234, emphasis in original). We took a risk by adapting our WAC/WID initiative to the findings from our interviews and what we understood about our MENA context. Exporting WI courses and WAC/WID initiatives to universities in the Middle East does not guarantee their success, just as integrating writing into engineering courses may not change faculty members' minds about how to teach their subject. Our institution's WAC/WID initiative, like those of many others, continues to negotiate and mediate faculty expectations for student writing in order to provide a cohesive, transformative experience for the students who walk our hallways.

Our study started with a very practical question: what did our disciplinary

faculty think about our WAC/WID initiative, and more specifically, how did they perceive their own role within that initiative? We concluded that hybrid writing positions like Kent's could help students come to terms with the conflicting expectations their engineering instructors held about writing, their experiences with traditional Gulf pedagogy (teacher-centered, product-oriented), and their exposure to writing and engineering pedagogy common to American institutions (student-centered, problem-based). Additionally, our IBC's focus on engineering allowed us to provide specialized support, a strategy also advocated by Strang (2006), who used professional tutors to provide "consistently high quality of one-on-one tutoring that results from their profound knowledge about writing" and, in some cases, their discipline (p. 295). Yet this inquiry also opened up new questions about the future of WAC/WID programs in the MENA region. Recent scholarship on translingual approaches to writing (Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbур, 2011) offers exciting possibilities for faculty development programs, particularly programs in the region which serve a diverse population of faculty and students. Such professional development could focus on all faculty members' hybrid roles and the ways we all move between and beyond boundaries, such as those between technical knowledge and writing knowledge, or between the titles of teacher and tutor.

## References

- Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(1), 3-25.
- Anson, C. M., & Donahue, C. (2015). Deconstructing "Writing Program Administration" in an international context. In D. S. Martin (Ed.), *Transnational writing program administration* (pp. 21-47). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Borger, M. (2007). Teaching cross-cultural perspectives in the Arabian Gulf: Academic bridge program, Doha, Qatar. Paper presented at the Society for Intercultural Education Training and Research conference. Retrieved from <http://www.sietar-europa.org/>
- Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carroll, L. A. (2012). *Rehearsing new roles: How college students develop as writers*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Carter, M. (2007). Ways of knowing, doing, and writing in the disciplines. *College Composition and Communication*, 58(3), 385-418.
- Donn, G., & Al Manthri, Y. (2010). *Globalization and higher education in the Arab Gulf States*. Didcot, UK: Symposium Books.
- Findlow, S. (2006). Higher education and linguistic dualism in the Arab Gulf. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(1), 19-36.

- Golkowska, K. U. (2013). Voice and dialogue in teaching reading/writing to Qatari students. *Journal of International Education Research*, 9(4), 339-344.
- Heyneman, S. P. (1997). The quality of education in the Middle East and North Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 17(4), 449-466.
- Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translangual approach. *College English*, 73(3), 303-321.
- Ives, L., Leahy, E., Leming, A., Pierce, T., & Schwartz, M. (2014). "I don't know if that was the right thing to do": Cross-disciplinary/cross-institutional faculty respond to L2 writing. In T.M. Zawacki & M. Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 211-240). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/l2/>
- LeCourt, D. (2012). WAC as critical pedagogy: The third stage? In T.M. Zawacki & P.M. Rogers (Eds.), *Writing across the curriculum: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 69-84). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Leydens, J. A. (2008). Novice and insider perspectives on academic and workplace writing: Toward a continuum of rhetorical awareness. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 51(3), 242-263.
- Leydens, J. A. (2012). Sociotechnical communication in engineering: An exploration and unveiling of common myths. *Engineering Studies*, 4(1), 1-9.
- Lyon, A. (2009). "You fail": Plagiarism, the ownership of writing, and transnational conflicts. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2), 222-239.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Jablonski, J. (2009). Beyond the L2 metaphor: Towards a mutually transformative model of ESL/WAC collaboration. *Academic Writing*. Retrieved from [http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/articles/matsuda\\_jablonski2000.htm](http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/articles/matsuda_jablonski2000.htm)
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Miller-Idriss, C., & Hanauer, E. (2011). Transnational higher education: Offshore campuses in the Middle East. *Comparative Education*, 47(2), 181-207.
- O'Neill, G. T. (2014). "Just a natural move towards English": Gulf youth attitudes towards Arabic and English literacy. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*, 11(1). Retrieved from <http://lthe.zu.ac.ae/index.php/lthehome/article/view/160>
- Sales, H. E. (2009). *Professional communication in engineering*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Selfe, C., & Hawisher, G.E. (2012). Exceeding the bounds of the interview: Feminism, mediation, narrative, and conversations about digital literacy. In L. Nickerson & M. P. Sheridan (Eds.), *Writing studies research in practice: Methods and methodologies* (pp. 36-50). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Steer, L., Ghanem, H., & Jalbout, M. (2014). Arab youth: Missing educational foundations for a productive life? Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/arab-youth-missing-educational-foundations-for-a-productive-life/>
- Steiner, D. G. (2011). The communication habits of engineers: A study of how composition style and time affect the production of oral and written communication



- of engineers. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 41(1), 33-58.
- Strang, S. (2006). Staffing a writing center with professional tutors. In C. Murphy & B. L. Stay (Eds.), *The writing center director's resource book* (pp. 291-299). New York: Routledge.
- Tomlinson, J. (1991). *Cultural imperialism: A critical introduction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Winsor, D. A. (1990). Engineering writing / writing engineering. *College Composition and Communication*, 41(1), 58-70.
- Winsor, D. A. (1996). *Writing like an engineer: A rhetorical education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Witte, S. (2010). Gulf State branch campuses: Global student recruitment. *International Higher Education*, 58, 5-6.
- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46(4), 506-521.
- Zawacki, T. M., & Habib, A. S. (2014). Negotiating "errors" in L2 writing: Faculty dispositions and language difference. In T. M. Zawacki & M. Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 183-210). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/l2/>

## Appendix: Interviewees

Name	Engineering Discipline	Faculty/ Staff	Course Description	Credit Hours of Course
Dr. Holly	Mechanical	Faculty	Senior Seminar	1
Dr. Sharifa	Chemical	Faculty	Engineering Lab	1
Dr. Miraj	Mechanical	Faculty	Ethics and Engineering	3
Dr. Burhan	Liberal Arts	Faculty	Ethics and Engineering	3
Dr. Rahmat	Petroleum	Faculty	Technical Presentations	1
Mr. Ahmed	Electrical and Computer	Staff	Senior Design Seminar	3
Mr. Mustafa	Electrical and Computer	Staff	Senior Design Seminar	3
Mr. Samir	Electrical and Computer	Staff	Senior Design Seminar	3
Dr. Pouyan	Mechanical/ Industrial	Faculty	Senior Design Seminar	1
Dr. Tareq	Mechanical	Faculty	Engineering Lab	3