

2

Affinity Work in the Teaching of Writing: The European Union Context

Ligia A. Mihut
BARRY UNIVERSITY, USA

Abstract. This chapter examines the impact of the European Union as a global force on local curricular and pedagogical enactments. The project takes into account personal, national, and global dimensions as they shape scholars' disciplinary identities and their choices in the teaching and research of writing. The analysis is based on qualitative research at West University of Timișoara, a renowned university in Romania, where eight professors were interviewed about their approaches to the teaching of writing; teaching artifacts such as syllabi, course posters, and teaching materials were also examined. Based on the findings, this chapter argues that scholars at this site perform a certain global discourse while also maintaining their local and national identity. The interplay of their personal and professional experiences involves push and pull forces that allow curricular performances to evolve rather than remain fixed in stable places or stable languages or stable disciplines. Building on this fluidity between languages, traditional writing cultures, and disciplinarity, the chapter argues that the logic of this fluidity is governed by affinity with a particular language, culture, or discourse and evolves through one's lifetime through interactions and global partnerships.

Reflection

My first encounter with the IRC was in 2011.¹ I was a graduate student on a leave of absence. Due to visa restrictions for international students, I had to return to Romania, my home country for the duration of my leave. While in Romania, I was working closely with another graduate student who was in the US, at University of Illinois, the same institution where I was pursuing

1 Please read the opening statement for this collection, "Editing in US-Based International Publications: A Position Statement," before reading this chapter.

my Ph.D. in English. The title of that conference presentation, “Global Selves: ‘The Struggle’ and the ‘Tools’ in Collaborative Research beyond the US Borders” captured the struggles of being an international student at an international site, attempting to present in the US at CCCC, the largest conference on writing. From Ellen Cushman’s *The Struggle and the Tools*, I borrowed the terminology needed to articulate the limitations and perspectives I faced as an international scholar. My challenges also stemmed from the fact that, at the time, I did not have access to our school library, and my colleague in the US became my mediator. The experience of doing research from an international site brought deep awareness about the impact of and the limitations of resources when it comes to transnational research. The IRC became a critical site where I could voice this realization. IRC created a space where conversations about international research were encouraged and valued, a space where international scholars could connect to and learn from each other. The following year in 2012, I was able to propose a new project and attend CCCC in person. My connection to IRC developed over the course of years since I stayed in touch with Tiane Donahue and became more familiar with her work of advocacy for international scholarship. In subsequent years, I followed Donahue’s example of advocacy in my involvement with the Transnational Composition Group of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). Working collaboratively with a team of scholars who have been members of this group, we used social media and various petitions to advocate and amplify the work and presence of international scholars at CCCC and beyond.

Institutional Context

Conducted at West University of Timișoara, Romania, this study is part of a larger project whose goal is to examine writing discourse in Colombia, India, Nepal, and Romania.² I chose Romania as a research site for two reasons: (1) I noticed a growing emphasis on writing in Eastern Europe and cross-cultural studies published in or about this region. Since I am originally from Romania, I identified the names of several Romanian scholars who have become increasingly visible due to their work and was intrigued to learn more; and (2) I was fascinated by conversations about writing in Romania specifically, a space that I knew prior to 2004 when I lived there but not in the last two

2 This collaborative study of writing in four different countries was sponsored by the 2015–2016 CCCC Research Initiative. The research team was composed of Sara Alvarez, Santosh Khadka, Shyam Sharma, and myself. Each team member visited one country Colombia, Nepal, India, and respectively, Romania.

decades. Having completed my formative education in Romania (K-12 and BA in English), I was learning about new writing initiatives that did not happen while I was a student there. Although I was connected linguistically and culturally to Romania, the current academic conversations were entirely new to me. I was able to connect with a scholar whose work I have read, Claudia Doroholschi, and inquired about the possibility of conducting a study at West University of Timișoara (Universitatea de Vest Timișoara) where she has been teaching. West University of Timișoara is one of the top universities in Romania. The fact that Doroholschi was already a published author allowed me to become familiarized with writing scholarship about Romania and the larger European space. This institution also hosted one of the first writing conferences in Eastern Europe. It was clear that extended conversations about writing were established in the region, and this school was a hub for these interactions. As the largest university in Western Romania, WUT serves 15,000 students, has 11 colleges and schools, and over 500 active partnerships with universities around the world. Overall, it aims to be an innovative, dynamic institution (“Why is WUT different?”/ “De ce este UVT altfel?”). I conducted my fieldwork in June of 2016 when I interviewed eight professors who were connected to the teaching of writing in Romanian, English, or German. In this chapter, I will focus on three accounts.

Introduction

This chapter examines the role of global forces, specifically the European Union’s impact on curricular and pedagogical approaches in local contexts. The project takes into account personal, national, and global influences and how scholars’ disciplinary identities and affinity for certain languages and cultures shape the teaching of writing. Based on analysis of qualitative research—interview data and teaching artifacts—at West University of Timișoara (WUT), Romania, this chapter argues that scholars at this site adopt a certain global discourse in their teaching and research while also maintaining their local and national identity. They do this by incorporating and connecting to larger writing cultures of Europe originating in France, Germany, and England/ the US. In doing so, they engage the European Union’s global and multicultural discourse without a disregard of their own national identity. This balance between unity (being an EU citizen) and diversity (being a Romanian in the EU), between the global and the national and the personal involves push and pull forces allowing curricular performances to evolve rather than stay fixed in stable places or stable languages or stable disciplines. Fluidity between identities, languages, or disciplinary spaces is

not new. However, what I argue is that the logic of this fluidity is governed by affinity with a particular language, culture, or discourse, and this logic has the power to disrupt hegemonic global forces. In the context of transnational mobility, data also show that all influences are complex and dynamic rather than unidimensional. I follow the complexity and dynamics of these forces in the account of three scholars who teach writing at West University of Timișoara (WUT) in Romania.

Affinity in the context of language and literacy studies has been theorized mostly in scholarship about online communities (e.g., DeLuca, 2018; Gee, 2005) and immigrant literacy and transnationalism (Mihut, 2014). I built on my previous work, *Stories from Our People*, where I defined affinity as “a capacious term comprising empathetic language, emotional and personal narratives as well as those relations that create the infrastructure of texts, people, and communities” (2014, p. 9). In this chapter, I refer to literacy as affinity that covers “all aspects of the learner’s life, across contexts vertically and horizontally” (Mihut, 2014, p. 13). Drawing on this definition, affinity implicates both the emotional work embedded in language and discourse and relationships formed based on commonality of experience, language, or culture. This latter aspect of affinity—relationships, connections, or points of intersections—is significant to the focus of this chapter as it shows how global scholars develop partnerships and remain influenced by mentors throughout their professional life trajectories.

Literature Review

Legacies: The Ethos of Learning and the Mutilated Curriculum

Studying academic literacy at West University of Timișoara, the same institution that I visited, Tilinca (2006) explains Romania’s unique writing culture by examining the geography of this region and a particular “ethos of learning.” Although geographically located in Central Europe, Romania is almost always associated politically with Eastern Europe and the former Communist bloc, shows Tilinca (citing Milan Kundera) in her dissertation. She further positions this space in its historical frame as part of Transylvania and thus, acknowledges its deep roots connecting it to the Austro-Hungarian empire. A famous saying refers to Romania as “a Latin island in a Slavic Sea” capturing Romania’s desire to establish its linguistic identity as a Romance language despite its geographical location—surrounded by Slavic-speaking countries. Most importantly, Tilinca (2006) points to two important discourses characterizing Romanian education, particularly higher education: (1) the ethos of learning and (2) the totalitarian discourse. In defining the ethos of learning,

Tilincă relies on Virgil Nemoianu's (1993) article, "Learning over Class: The Case of the Central European Ethos" that defined it as "focused not on gainful labor and individual achievement but on the acquisition of learning and on the communitarian recognition of the primacy of learning as a standard of merit and social advancement" (p. 79). Essentially, this means that Romanian society valued learning and books and invested in literary societies through which they promoted the value of education and being educated over one's social position in society. Drawing on Nemoianu, Tilincă explains that in 1882 there were close to 4,000 cultural societies in the Hungarian part of the Austro-Hungarian empire which included Transylvania (now a Romanian region). The numbers skyrocketed to 11,000 in the early 20th century. Some of these literary societies have been linked to the formation of national academies in this region; others led to special interest groups who initiated schools, book clubs and later, public libraries (Tilincă, 2006, p. 12).

The other influential force on writing in Romania's higher education has been the totalitarian regime. The communist rule pushed countries from Central Europe further east in terms of "culture and learning" (Tilincă, 2006). While books and literacy continued to hold a significant role, the political regime appropriated and used the ethos of learning to serve its purpose: to manipulate and exercise social control. One such example is the change of curriculum. Tilincă calls this change the "mutilated curriculum," a school curriculum that preserved the hard sciences intact while retooling the humanities to serve a nationalist agenda and cutting off social sciences entirely. Although much of the writing in K-12 and postsecondary education in Romania was influenced by the French and German traditions before the Communist regime, after its installation, this changed; language and writing became channeled into one dominant way of communication, "the official speak," meant to serve the country's political agenda (Pavlenko et al., 2014). This official discourse made use of stale expressions and overuse of superlatives to describe the perfect socialist life. In other words, it became synonymous with falsehood or as Sonia Pavlenko et al. (2014) explain, "wooden language"—language that is fixed, unmovable, lacking substance and meaning. Significant changes in the curriculum were shaped by the Soviet model's push for standardization, the monopoly of the state over institutions of higher education, and an advancement of a centralized economy which decided majors and specializations (e.g., technical, medical, and agricultural studies) (Doroholschi et al., 2018). Additionally, in higher education, teaching was separated from research where the latter was moved to specialized research centers. The reintegration of research into the university occurred gradually after the 1989 revolution, however only after Romania's adherence to the European Union in 2007, did significant

changes emerge. Romania's integration into the EU engendered support for various research projects, funding and grants for research, and substantive assistance in collaborative partnerships for teaching and research.

EU's Impact on Higher Education in Romania

EU mandates, values, and vision have significantly impacted higher education in Romania and in the region. In addition to larger trends of increased mobility and new technologies that are pervasive worldwide, the EU also acknowledges specific countries' history and identity; thus, there is a constant dance between unity and diversity. Countries from the Eastern European bloc, however, have had their unique path of change and transformation. Doroholschi et al. (2018) explain that former communist countries, generally placed under the Eastern European banner, have been regrouped under Central and Eastern Europe and called "transition countries" (p. 4). This relabeling perhaps comes in an effort to remove the stigma of these countries being considered "left behind" compared to Western Europe. The structure, philosophy, and practice of higher education in this region have relied on the Humboldtian model of education with a rigorous research emphasis. However, certain countries like Romania followed closely the French educational system because of the Latin origin of Romanian and French languages. Being affiliated linguistically with the French allowed the Romanians to claim kinship of culture and language and simultaneously reject the Russian influence, which has always posed a threat to Romania's sovereignty.

The most significant transformation of higher education in Europe, a period of "redefinition and reform" (Doroholschi et al., 2018), has been affected by the Bologna Declaration signed on 19 June 1999. Included below are a series of propositions of this reform, which by and large emphasize connectivity and easy transfer of credits and credentials:

Connecting national systems through issues such as shared degree programs, a credit transfer system, qualification frameworks, and accreditation programs to make educational programs in Europe more transparent and more permeable across countries. (Kruse et al., 2016, p. 12)

With the Bologna Declaration and the restructuring of higher education, a significant growth emerged in partnerships and exchanges between institutions and researchers in Europe, especially between the East and the West regions of Europe. One of the challenges of the Bologna process poses a critical dilemma. On the one hand, it has been instrumental in enforcing

more standardized ways of learning in EU countries. On the other hand, it has sought to foster multilingualism and cross-cultural communication as a European value. According to the EU's official language policy, it is a European value "to promote multilingualism with a view to strengthening social cohesion, intercultural dialogue and European construction" (Council of the European Union, 2008, p. 3). There is an apparent contradiction between fostering plurilingual approaches where EU countries are encouraged to promote their own identity, language, and culture and standardized educational goals where distinct features of one's educational system have been erased in the interest of EU values and platforms.

EU standards and vision become apparent in what programs and collaborative projects are selected for funding. In terms of writing, I noticed a surge of collaborative projects with scholars representing various EU countries, which may suggest an underlying EU preference to incentivize the study of writing education through a comparative, plurilingual approach. A few of such studies include Madalina Chitez and Otto Kruse, 2012; Chitez et al., 2015; Pavlenko et al., 2014; these studies explore genres across contexts, writing cultures in different countries, and the influence of various rhetorical traditions on local writing practices. One partnership called Literacy Development in the Humanities (LITHUM) that started in 2011 brought together scholars and institutions from three different countries from Eastern/ Southeastern Europe and one from Switzerland. The purpose of the LITHUM project was to investigate academic writing and the larger context of higher education such as the impact of internationalization; the context of academic publications; the development of new genres determined by the Bologna process; the growth of multilingualism, and the role of English as the new lingua franca (Kruse et al., 2018, p. 30). The results show similarities in terms of writing cultures, in particular writing genres which was the focal point of analysis, despite the diverse histories of the countries involved in the partnership: Ukraine, Romania, Macedonia, and Switzerland. The results also emphasize the need to facilitate access to international disciplinary communities, develop shared resources, adopt mentorship models for conference presentations and publications, and invest in the development of new writing courses which are to be integrated in the curriculum (Kruse et al., 2018).

Other projects and partnerships reflect, in part, the EU's commitment to diversity, research, mobility, justice, and other European values. Under the pressure of globalizing forces, many studies on writing in the European Union context examine writing comparatively as shown earlier but also explore the larger intellectual writing traditions that have permeated European universities—the Anglo-Saxon, German, and French influence. Each one of these

writing traditions captures a distinct intellectual approach: (1) the Anglo-Saxon is focused on logic, data analysis, and purpose; (2) the German is meant to advance a theory and engage in dialog, or (3) the French aims to display eloquence (Pavlenko et al., 2014). These writing traditions are widely present and discussed both in writing scholarship in European countries and were mentioned numerous times by my respondents during the interviews. There is certainly the danger of approaching these rhetorical traditions through an essentialist lens as a unified, singular representation of the nation, culture, and respectively language with which they are associated. A long history of contrastive rhetoric originating with Robert Kaplan (1966) has pointed to the problems of this type of essentialist approach and subsequent studies and uptakes of contrastive rhetoric have interrogated, expanded, and critiqued it extensively. Offering a thorough critique of contrastive rhetoric is beyond the scope of this chapter, especially since many scholars have already accomplished this effectively, and exposed the limits of contrastive rhetoric due to its “reductionist, deterministic, prescriptive, and essentialist orientation” (Kubota & Lehner, 2004, p. 10). A *critical* contrastive rhetoric, however, underscores systems of power and marginalization as well as a dynamic view of language and culture (Kubota & Lehner, 2004). While the three rhetorical traditions mentioned earlier—the Anglo-Saxon, German, and French—are slightly different from contrastive rhetoric in that they emphasize three different languages, English, German, and French rather than English as the only measuring standard, associating one language with one nation remains reductionist and problematic. At the same time, we need to understand these traditions are introduced from the perspectives of those on the ground who have been affected by these writing traditions and the message they exported to other countries at the margins of Europe. In this chapter, I capture the participants’ perceptions of mainstream rhetorics circulating in Europe, because the participants themselves mentioned them in the interviews and often, identified or connected their own writing identity, their institution, or the Romanian writing culture to these mainstream rhetorics. Whether they have done so critically or not is debatable. In taking a grounded theory approach, this chapter accounts for the participants’ perspective on this matter, which becomes even more significant when the respective participant’s identity has been marginalized or in search of legitimation. Whether politically, culturally, or linguistically, Romania and the Romanian subject has sought and fought over the course of years to establish their identity and value in the European context, but due to various factors, this process of legitimation has developed by seeking identification or at least association with other European countries that were larger, more powerful, wealthier, and with broader influence. While it is essential to avoid treating traditions as essentialist, it is also absolutely crucial to understand their spread of influence

on people, cultures, and languages that have been traditionally marginalized or deemed insignificant in Europe and to view them through the powerful influence they exerted over other languages and cultures in Europe.

Such an orientation towards established writing traditions/ histories is necessary particularly in the case of smaller countries like Romania. Like many other countries in Southern and Eastern Europe, Romania occupies a small territory, and their languages are only used by a limited number of people. As Pavlenko et al. (2014) explain, Romania has a particular history that shapes writing instruction in higher education institutions. By joining the European Union, Romania has gained an open door to reinstallation of research and development of new, original ideas.

It is against this backdrop of both Romania and the EU context that I situate this study of the teaching of writing at West University of Timișoara. As shown earlier, Romania in the European context emerges as deeply connected to the main intellectual traditions (Anglo-Saxon, German, and French). The connections to these writing cultures are complex and often follow a logic that is nonlinear. I explored these connections and affinities with languages and cultures of Europe in the remainder of the chapter.

Methods and Methodology

Data Collection

Of the eight interviews with professors teaching writing at West University of Timișoara, I selected three accounts whose references to global mobility and EU were tied to one or more of the three rhetoric traditions mentioned in much of the scholarship from this region: the German influence, the Anglo-Saxon, and the French writing tradition. These three professors, Drs. Tucan, Țăra, and Șandor provided insightful accounts concerning the impact of EU on the curriculum, student and faculty mobility, and the teaching of writing, in general.

This chapter's data come from a larger cross-cultural, multi-sited, collaborative study of writing in four different sites—Romania, Nepal, India, and Colombia. Our research team's main research questions centered on two key issues: (1) writing identity/ definitions and (2) globalization.³ We asked: (1) How do writing scholars in particular international sites define writing in college and (2) What is the role of internationalization and mobility in the teaching of writing at those respective sites? The specific interview questions are included in Appendix A. In this chapter, I focus only on data that I collected at one site,

3 The research team was composed of Sara Alvarez, Santosh Khadka, Shyam Sharma, and myself.

the West University of Timișoara, Romania and will only address the second research question about internationalization and mobility. I gathered qualitative data, specifically eight interviews with professors who were teaching writing in various humanities-related disciplines (English, Romanian, German, etc.) and extent data such as course syllabi that the respondents shared with me. All interviews were conducted in June 2016 and they vary in length ranging from 40 to 100 minutes. Overall, I obtained 469 minutes of interview data resulting in 208 pages of transcript that were analyzed using grounded theory and emerging codes. Guided by constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006), I applied both apriori codes such as EU, diversity, mobility, etc., which were established in response to the second research question and in vivo codes—descriptive codes that allowed me to preserve our participants' exact language or phrasing. Based on this coding, I identified four major categories of analysis referring to the internationalization of writing in Romania: (1) mobility of faculty and scholars (codes: "partnerships" or "exchanges" or "faculty area of expertise"); (2) mobility of students (code: "student exchanges"); (3) writing traditions (codes: "Anglo-Saxon," "French influence," "German tradition," "Russian influence," "The Romanian way of writing," etc.); and (4) pedagogy, teaching tools, and assessment (codes: "textbook," "bibliographies," "Cambridge exams"). In Appendix B, I provided a sample of my coding.

In this chapter, I will discuss writing traditions/ influences since this was the most prevalent of these four major themes. Also, I only discuss three accounts because they offered the most information on these writing traditions. I coded all the transcripts solo since most of the interviews were conducted in Romanian and no one else in our research team spoke the language. Once I focused on the writing traditions/ influences, I identified the details surrounding the mentioning of these rhetorical traditions and when they were invoked: to define their own writing culture, to point to the current trends in writing, or to refer to the institutional or national writing culture, etc.

Background of the Three Professors

Dr. Țăra: A professor of Romanian studies with French influences. Dr. Țăra teaches a course in written communication (to sophomores) and a course in

4 Although this code may seem unusual relative to faculty mobility, it is in fact directly related to mobility since one's ability to speak English and one's area of expertise often determine the type and extent of international connections and partnerships. Faculty in the English department, for instance, have been much more mobile in EU while faculty from the Romanian department, much less because their expertise in the Romanian language and culture does not transfer easily across borders.

paleography for graduate students; both courses are taught in Romanian. He has graduated with a double specialization: French and Romanian studies and classical languages: Greek and Latin. His dissertation was focused on Latin linguistics, old texts, and the transition period from the widespread use of Latin to Romance languages. His understanding of old texts and the written word's role in preserving and changing society and culture has largely shaped his approach to writing. In his course in written communication, for instance, Dr. Țăra has included a unit on the stakes of writing in the transition from the oral culture to a written culture in Ancient Greece. His purpose is to emphasize the ways in which writing contributes to knowledge making and the preservation, circulation, and study of texts.

Dr. Tucan: A professor of Romanian studies with English/Anglo-Saxon influences. Dr. Tucan teaches two courses in the MA program titled, Literature and Culture within Romanian and European Contexts. One course is Literature and Trauma, focusing on the most tragic events in the 20th century, the Holocaust and the Gulag and a second course in Academic Writing. Dr. Tucan's approach to the teaching of writing, although having the same disciplinary affiliation as Dr. Țăra, is permeated by various terminologies and rhetorical moves typical to the Anglo-Saxon rhetoric. Perhaps, this is due to his participation in transnational partnerships with colleagues from Switzerland, Macedonia, and Ukraine. Dr. Tucan adopts Swales' rhetorical moves and inserts them in a MA course in academic writing. Not only have the partnerships raised awareness about various rhetorical traditions, but they also introduced the participants to empirical research and methodologies. Both approaches to writing are enlightening yet one scholar (Dr. Țăra) leans toward a more traditional approach towards mobility and English as a lingua franca while the other scholar (Dr. Tucan) is readily embracing the influences of the globalization and the EU mobility to and between EU countries. Dr. Tucan speaks and writes in English but has been educated in French language and literature.

Dr. Șandor: A professor of German studies. Dr. Șandor teaches courses in linguistics, such as grammar, syntax, morphology, and dialectology. In terms of writing courses, she teaches scientific writing which is integrated into practical courses; Dr. Șandor also teaches courses in editing and proofreading.⁵ She explained that with the Bologna process, there has been a stronger push toward uniformity of the curriculum which effected changes in writing courses as well. With the Bologna process, a course that used to be taught toward the end of a four-year BA degree, with emphasis on thesis writing, got

5 Practical courses are similar to U.S. labs. They can be connected to a lecture course or offered independently covering particular subjects/ themes.

moved into the first-year curriculum with the title “Techniques of Scientific Writing.” Şandor also explained that it is customary for German lecturers and professors to serve as visiting professors. As a result, much of the content of a writing course is shaped by practices developed at German universities. For instance, a writing genre/ paper called “referat” in the German school means an oral presentation, while in most contexts, it is a review of literature or a report without the critical evaluation of sources.

Findings

The key findings show the EU influence manifests in three different ways: (1) the mobility within EU and the partnerships established, (2) student mobility, and (3) the restructuring of the curriculum and the influence of traditional rhetorical traditions: German, Anglo-Saxon, and French. The accounts of the three professors I interviewed show that scholars on the ground resist following one single, unidirectional narrative—adopting the EU values and mobility at face value or uncritically implementing EU mandates in their local context. Rather, the EU influence on their teaching is varied and non-linear. In fact, even when a direct correlation of influence is established such as a professor who speaks French to be influenced by the French writing tradition or a professor in the German studies to adopt the German style of writing, etc., this does not always happen. The influences of these global writing cultures are varied and dynamic.

The results of the analysis show that each of these professors’ affinity with a particular intellectual tradition of writing is not fixed, but rather evolving. Whether they were initially influenced by one of these established rhetorics—Anglo-Saxon, French, and German—or new actions through global mandates, over time other influences have shaped their views and teaching of writing. Altogether each of these influences are contested or permeated by their personal, professional, and institutional identities. Ultimately, my observation is that their connection to a particular writing culture is governed by affinity. They were most influenced by a writing tradition with which they shared a certain connection or commonality of experience, knowledge of a language, or culture that influenced their approach to writing.

Affinity with the Anglo-Saxon Rhetoric and English as Global Language

First, one of the respondents showed a clear affinity with the Anglo-Saxon rhetoric by pointing to identification (E.g., we write like the English or like the French); writing genres, and course bibliography. Of the three rhetorical

traditions have been mentioned, Dr. Tucan mentioned them relative to definitions of writing and situating one's identity in connection to these established writing cultures. He explains this as follows,

this discussion [about how the teaching of writing in Romania] is absolutely contextual. In the Romanian university context, not to mention K-12, writing was not taught. Lately, however, under the influence of Anglo-Saxon academy, conversation emerged about what it means to write in the context of one's discipline.

As our conversation about definitions of writing evolved towards writing genres and what is being taught in a writing course, Tucan referred to "a terminology chaos in the Romanian context," which he attributed to the "lack of a [writing] tradition." He further explains:

For instance, many call a paper that we ask students to write, a research paper, an original paper with all the key elements; others call it an essay. Well, in the Romanian context, we understand an essay to be something completely different, especially compared to those in the English department.

Notable is that Tucan keeps referring to writing in the Romanian context by comparing traditions or genres to what happens in English or Anglo-Saxon writing culture (notice that this is his terminology). He attributes the conversations about writing and writing in the discipline to the Anglo-Saxon education/ influence. In fact, comparing Romania to other writing cultures is also reflected in the fact that in the bibliography of a course he teaches in Romanian, Tucan has included texts about writing and research written by Romanian authors but also by English authors, such as Swales and his well-established rhetorical moves. This openness towards the Anglo-Saxon and English influences is interesting especially since he is a professor of Romanian studies with a background in French. Yet, through an affinity to the English language, Tucan has allowed other writing influences than what we would typically expect from a scholar with his background.

Despite his background and knowledge of French, we find him offering a critique of the French influence on the Romanian writing culture:

This has to do the French influence that was fairly strong, that at some point configured our institutions. This is what the French influence did: it made it so that Romania would not talk about writing. Writing was learned through imitation.... But things changed in France, too.

As Tucan further elaborates on the content of the writing course he has taught, he contrasts the French or traditional writing (his terminology) to the newer influences of the Anglo-Saxon rhetoric. In his course, he explains to students the need to master the new model (the Anglo-Saxon) not just because English is the *lingua franca* of academia, (the way French used to be at least in Romania), but because it helps students in search of sources in international databases and this rhetoric explicitness is helpful to students. Tucan's perspective about English as the main language of communication in writing courses in universities in Eastern and Central Europe is both supported by research (e.g., Harbord, 2010) but also by a certain culture of appreciation of the English and American language.

In this scholar's approach to writing and the teaching of writing, the need to clarify writing terminology emerges forcefully as he situates writing in the Romanian context and in relationship to other major rhetorical traditions. The genres and the bibliography of the course he is teaching are imbued with his awareness that writing in the Romanian context is tied to the past (the French model of education) but also to the present moment and future as English is the *lingua franca* in academia.⁶ As such, we note the dynamics of influences in his professional and linguistic formation (he mentions having learned English in high school but later focusing on French and now back to English) and in the evolution of the global academic sphere. His approach to the teaching of writing allows Romanian texts and Anglo-Saxon rhetoric (Swales' rhetorical moves) to shape students' praxis so that they can stay attuned to the current moment. His approach aligns with EU mobility and the fluidity of global forces, largely influenced by his own affinity with the English language.

Affinity with Old Traditions of Writing: The French, German, and Ancient Greek Rhetoric

In the case of Dr. Țăra, the influence of French rhetoric and tradition is noted in the process of transition from the Romanian system of education to the French one when he was a Ph.D. student at the Sorbonne. In turn, his own experience and disciplinary affiliation has impacted his approach to the

6 The French model of education has not been defined in detail by any of the participants. However, in Romania, it is a known fact that the French have influenced the Romanian education system. Doroholschi (2018) and many other scholars have mentioned this influence as well. The French influence was dominant even in the fact that French was one of the mandatory foreign languages that all K-12 Romanian students had to learn in addition to English or German.

teaching of writing. First, Dr. Țăra refers to the “old style professors,” who would contend that “every statement is an argument.” According to Țăra, they were formed in the German school which means “fantastic precision and rigor.” From this acknowledgement of the German influence of his professors/ mentors, he elaborated on the fact that the school of linguistics in Romania has a long-established tradition whose foundations were laid out by the Germans. Established during the interwar period, Țăra further explains, “the golden age of Romanian linguistics” continued during the communist period and the emergence of the Romanian studies linguists, scholars, scholars whose work Țăra found in Western libraries. In his views, these scholars’ work was written to endure the test of time; they constitute, as he explains, “models of engagement” with text, “models of scholarship.”

This type of admiration and respect for a particular scholarship is not atypical. As a scholar who was educated in the region, I identify with Țăra’s perspective. I was also educated to value and align my scholarly aspirations to a certain standard of excellence that was determined by the academic culture in Romania at the time. How those standards were established was, however, a mystery. What is known is that when it comes to the teaching of writing, as mentioned earlier, Dr. Țăra adopts an orientation towards the past, the French tradition due to his doctoral training in France and the German tradition that shaped writing and research in Romania in the old golden period before the Communist regime. Țăra also showed appreciation of the written culture of Ancient Greece. His belief is that an understanding of the role of writing in the past can shape the present and future. His preference for the preservation and value of the Romanian language, in particular the lexis, surfaced as he mentioned the current influence of English on the Romanian vocabulary. He encourages students to resist the “anglicization” of the Romanian language. To be more exact, he upholds that English lexis should be used only when a Romanian equivalent is not available in Romanian.

These instances—Țăra’s appreciation of the “old-fashioned professor” and the established German rigor of older scholarship, a preservation of Romanian lexis instead of the new English wave, and the influence of Ancient Greek culture—points to dynamic influences that are strikingly different from Dr. Tucan’s. While Tucan is oriented towards changes moving forward, Dr. Țăra seeks change and inspiration for the current moment in the old traditions of scholarship and mentors. Tucan is also preoccupied with language and rhetoric in a more abstract or objective way. He mentions Swales and other texts that shape the Romanian ways of writing, but Țăra, in his discussion of French and German influences on writing, identifies people. He particularizes influences of professors and mentors whom he seems to know

and remember in a personal manner. Tucan displays an affinity for trends, lingua franca, and global change while Țăra shows an affinity with memorable experiences occasioned by mentors or key influencers of a movement or school of thought.

Affinity through Heritage Language and Cultures: Long-term Partnerships and Exchanges

In Șandor's account, my analysis shows that the EU's most significant impact on writing comes in the form of partnerships, workshops, and exchanges. These are established either between scholars, schools, or students from Germany and Romania. For instance, in response to my question about the teaching materials and resources for teaching writing in the German major, Dr. Șandor explained that she had attended a series of workshops with colleagues from Giessen, Germany, in the context of a partnership that lasted for five years. Due to the specialization of several colleagues at this school, academic writing was one of the topics of the workshops. Interestingly, as Șandor showed, the partnership offered workshops not only for faculty but for all students too—freshmen, sophomore, and junior students. During this partnership, teaching materials and resources were exchanged as well as open conversations about writing practices, conventions, citations, and other writing norms. Șandor provided a specific example about citations:

Here in Romania, I wouldn't say it's just the German tradition but in general, a few years ago, there was a general way of citing a source: someone said this or referred to "someone once said." We did not have to provide the exact source, to give the exact moment or place, right? So, very vague.

This "vagueness" in citations is further discussed in terms of the structure of a scientific text. While in Romanian, the writing guidelines are evolving, the German influence on citations and writing is felt strong as shown in the next section.

These partnerships between schools, scholars, and students in Germany and Romania—some of which having been established before the adherence to the EU—and the nature of these partnerships make this German influence on writing unique. First, the influence of the German school in Romania has been established longer than the EU presence. Șandor mentions that writing was taught in the German major since the 90s. This is much earlier than the current trends and conversations about writing in the context of the EU and the Bologna process. For instance, the partnership with the Giessen school

was not an EU-sponsored project which suggests that various other types of interactions and influences have been taking place outside of the EU purview. This, perhaps, explains why mobility in the German major has multiple levels of interactions, where German professors teach workshops but also spend a longer time teaching and training at Romanian universities. Mobility and exchanges also operate between students, especially those close to graduation who are provided with the chance to do research at German schools. This affords them with a wide range of resources and research opportunities, as Șandor explains.

Second, these partnerships are more ample in their reach than traditional EU partnerships due to cultural, geographic, and historical affinities. The students involved in these exchanges and partnerships are not necessarily new to mobility although they may be new to academic discourse and research. Many students interested in the German major are, in fact, bilingual and/or ethnically German. Due to the ethnocultural context of this region, the Banat region, where West University of Timișoara is located, we can find a large number of German minorities who attend bilingual K-12 schools and speak German as their first language. Unlike the English and French majors, the German major mostly includes heritage speakers of German, and for this reason, their relationship with the German language and culture is unique. Many of them have family in Germany and are used to visiting and traveling back and forth. This ethnocultural connection to Germany enhances the type of partnership and exchanges that are established between academic institutions because the latter is built on already existent personal and cultural affinities with the German language.

While the German writing tradition and rigor in citations and the partnerships established are expected influences, Dr. Șandor added a surprising observation: “Lately, Germany resembles very much the English and American tradition ... therefore, we became affiliated a bit with the larger model. However, in the Romanian tradition, there are certain aspects that are different or in the French one, certain aspects that are different and we discuss this.” Although the German tradition is clearly dominant, a movement toward the Anglo-Saxon “larger” models is notable here, as Șandor explains. This shows a dynamic movement of influences and traditions. Similar to Tucan’s and Țăra’s observations, the factors that shape one’s approach to writing are not uni-dimensional. While the German writing tradition remains pervasive in this case due to its cultural and intellectual presence in the region, it has been impacted by Anglo-American rhetoric. Instead of resistance, Șandor chooses to define this phenomenon of change in terms of “affiliation,” or connectedness to larger global practices.

In the three cases studied, Tucan embraces the Anglo-Saxon rhetoric and its influence on his teaching of writing, Țăra shows a resistance in terms of anglicization and aligns his approach to writing to older models and traditions such as the older German influence, while Șandor adopts this change as affiliation, as a dynamic movement to new knowledge. In all three cases, the influences of French, German, and Anglo-Saxon rhetorics are dynamic and evolving rather than static. Initially, due to Țăra's training in the French writing tradition, it was expected that the French school would be the sole influence, but the earlier analysis shows his mention of old mentors who had been trained in the German school. Similarly, Tucan brings forth his French training and Șandor the German school of influence, but in fact, both acknowledge the current influence of English and the Anglo-Saxon writing tradition with its explicitness of conventions, citations practices, and argument structure. These various responses to the global writing cultures are also governed by various affinities to the language, culture, or other aspects of the respective writing tradition. In some cases, such as the German influence, the affinity with the culture, heritage, and history creates stronger ties. In other cases, we note a desire to affiliate with what is modern and global, with the writing in English that has become, for better or for worse, *lingua franca* particularly in academic discourse and culture.

Conclusion

In this chapter, my goal was to explore the interplay between global and local forces in the teaching of writing in Eastern Europe, in particular in Romania. My analysis focused on three scholars' accounts whose affiliation is not directly related to English since they teach writing in the Romanian studies and German studies majors. What emerges with clarity is the way in which these scholars situate writing in their disciplines relative to larger, global intellectual traditions: French, German, and Anglo-Saxon. However, these influences are dynamic rather than one-dimensional. These traditional rhetorics have impacted the teaching of writing not just in the current EU context but also in the past such as the French influence on Romanian education or the German school on German studies. In addition to dynamic forces, there is a clear complexity in how partnerships are established and how scholars react to global influences, in particular English and the Anglo-Saxon rhetoric. Some choose to embrace it, others to resist, and yet, others to create connections and ways to move forward in their own understanding of writing. The result is not one model or one set of factors but a series of factors always on the move based on affinity with a language, culture, or mentoring experiences.

Glossary

Ethos of learning: Virgil Nemoianu (1993) provides this term “the ethos of learning” as a descriptor of 20th century Romanian society that valued learning, books, and literacy over social class. Nemoianu contrasts the ethos of learning to the “Protestant work ethic” as the bedrock of capitalism in Western societies to show Central Europe’s, including Romania’s, attention “not on gainful labor and individual achievement but on the acquisition of learning and on the communitarian recognition of the primacy of learning as a standard of merit and social advancement” (1993, p. 79).

French/ German/ Anglo-Saxon rhetoric (writing tradition): Pavlenko et al. (2014) provide a definition of academic writing traditions in different cultures by drawing on Dirk Siepmann (2006). Siepmann (2006), in turn, first relies on Galtung’s classification of Saxon, French, and German writing traditions based on differences in “thought and writing patterns” (Siepmann, 2006, p. 132). The Saxon or Anglo-Saxon associated with writing in the US and UK is defined as collaborative; aimed at proposing a hypothesis rather than a theory; and, amenable to dialog and divergent viewpoints. The French intellectual style, on the other hand, has been equated to “linguistic artistry” which presupposes attention to style and clarity and a tendency to conceal criticism of alternative views. The German writing tradition marked by its focus on “theory formation and deductive reasoning” follows an apprentice-based model rather than directly teaching writing. While Galtung’s classification has been criticized for its discrete, essentialist, and simplified approach to writing and cultures, a critique that Siepmann briefly addresses, these writing traditions are further studied by Siepmann in the context of education in Britain, France, and Germany. Thus, Siepmann (2006) extends his analysis to actual writing genres and writing expectations in these different countries where he examines prompts, organization, paragraphing, and language and style expectations in order to propose suggestions for translation. While Galtung’s classification seems reductionist, Siepmann’s goes a step further to examine the context and the genres of writing in these three different countries/ regions: the US/ UK, France, and Germany. These writing cultures and contexts are important for this chapter since less prominent cultures and countries in the context of the European Union, such as Romania tend to define their own writing tradition relative to the above-mentioned, long-standing writing traditions—Anglo-Saxon, French, and German.

Mutilated curriculum: “The mutilated curriculum” is a term introduced by Mihaela Tilinca to describe the changes and cuts of the curriculum during the Communist regime in Romania. Tilinca (2006, p. 15) defines it as the party-state

controlled education through forcing a mutilated curriculum into the system of education: “pure sciences” as Maths, Physics, Chemistry could do no harm, so these were in and they were allotted many hours; Romanian and History were the appropriate channels for presenting the “heroes” of Romanian history and life and to represent the “Western” and/or the rich as the enemy; any discipline that could teach critical thinking or reflectivity on social issues could not be allowed to exist, so social sciences and applied sciences were banned from schools, libraries or bookshops; the texts and/or the literary fragments included in school textbooks were under severe censorship (e.g., what we could read in our textbooks for English were either invented texts meant to teach us how to present the achievements of communist Romania to foreigners or literary texts chosen to capture the life of the poor and Western world as a profoundly unjust world, Dickens’ *Bleak House* or A. Miller’s *Death of a Salesman*).

References

- Council of the European Union. (2008, November 21). Council resolution on a European strategy on multilingualism (pp. 1-5). https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/104230.pdf
- Charmaz, K. C. (2006). *Constructing ground theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. SAGE.
- Chitez, M., & Kruse, O. (2012). Writing cultures and genres in European higher education. In M. Castello & C. Donahue (Eds.), *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies* (pp. 151-178). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. <https://digitalcollection.zhaw.ch/handle/11475/8727>
- Chitez, M., Kruse, O., & Castelló, M. (2015). The European writing survey (EUWRIT): Background, structure, implementation, and some results. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 9, ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences. <https://digitalcollection.zhaw.ch/bitstream/11475/1016/1/407433819.pdf>
- DeLuca, K. (2018). Shared passions, shared compositions: Online fandom communities and affinity groups as sites for public writing pedagogy. *Computers and Composition*, 47, 5-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2017.12.003>
- Doroholschi, C. I., Tucan, D., Chitez, M., & Kruse, O. (2018). Introduction: Academic writing in the context of Central and Eastern European higher education. In M. Chitez, C. I. Doroholschi, O. Kruse, L. Salski, & D. Tucan (Eds.), *University writing in Central and Eastern Europe: Tradition, transition, and innovation* (pp. 1-12). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95198-0_1
- Gee, J. P. (2005). Semiotic social spaces and affinity spaces. In D. Barton & K. Tusting (Eds.), *Beyond communities of practice: Language, power, and social context* (214-32). Cambridge University Press.
- Harbord, J. (2010). Writing in Central and Eastern Europe: Stakeholders and directions in initiating change. *Across the Disciplines*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2010.7.1.03>

- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning* 16, 1-20.
- Kruse, O., Chitez, M., Rodriguez, B. & M. Castelló. (2016). Academic writing in Europe: An overview. In O. Kruse, M. Chitez, B. Rodriguez, & M. Castelló (Eds.), *Exploring European writing cultures. Country reports on genres, writing practices and languages used in European higher education* (pp. 11-23). ZHAW Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften. <https://tinyurl.com/yueb3j9e>
- Kruse, O., Chitez, M., Bekar, M., Doroholschi, C. I., & Yakhontova, T. (2018). Studying and developing local writing cultures: An institutional partnership project supporting transition in Eastern Europe's higher education. In M. Chitez, C. I. Doroholschi, O. Kruse, L. Salski, & D. Tucan (Eds.), *University writing in Central and Eastern Europe: Tradition, transition, and innovation* (pp. 29-43). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95198-0_3
- Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 7-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.003>
- Mihut, L. (2014). "Stories from my People:" *Immigrants, brokers, and literacy as affinity*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign]. IDEAL Illinois Library: Graduate Dissertations and Theses at Illinois. <https://hdl.handle.net/2142/49704>
- Nemoianu, V. (1993). Learning over class: The case of the Central European ethos. In A. Rigney & D. W. Fokkema (Eds.), *Cultural participation: Trends since the Middle Ages* (pp. 79-107). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/upal.31.08nem>
- Pavlenko, S., Christina Bojan, C., Kelemen, A., & Alhaus, M. (2014). Academic writing: Global views and Romanian trends. *Transylvanian Review*, 23(1), 257-268.
- Siepmann, D. (2006). Academic writing and culture: An overview of differences between English, French, and German. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 51(1), 131-150. <https://doi.org/10.7202/012998ar>
- Tilincă, M. E. (2006). Academic literacy and the construction of symbolic power: A study of one academic community. [Doctoral dissertation] Lancaster University.
- Universitatea de Vest Timișoara. (n.d.). "Why is WUT different?"/ "De ce este UVT altfel?" <https://admitere.uvt.ro/despre-uvt/de-ce-este-uvt-altfel/>

Appendix A. Interview Questions

1. What does "writing" mean to you as a scholar and teacher? Please elaborate its functions and meanings in the context of higher education in your country or part of the world.
2. What kinds of writing courses do you teach at your institution and in your discipline? What department are these courses part of?
3. What kind of student populations do you serve when you teach writing? What is the linguistic and cultural context of teaching writing at your institution?
4. Are the writing courses (or components) that you teach provided to

- you or do you create or adapt them? If you create or adapt courses, materials, or teaching methods, please describe how you do that.
5. Does the curriculum or teaching of writing in your institution or country involve subject matters or communication skills related to globalization and international issues?
 6. Do you deal with multiple languages as formal/informal part of teaching writing? If so, how?
 7. As a teacher/ scholar of writing [or a related discipline], do you (or the curriculum provided to you) draw(s) on more than one linguistic, cultural, and rhetorical resources? If you are involved in research/ scholarship and professional development activities, do these resources influence those engagements? (How) do you draw upon different cultures, languages, literacy backgrounds, and writing practices that your students bring into the classroom?
 8. What kinds of literacy and writing practices are your students engaged in outside of school? Are those practices in any way related to global issues and writing/communication in cross-cultural or international contexts?

Appendix B. Sample Coding

Participant	Transcript	Coding
Bogdan Țăra	It [Romanian] is part of Europe, that it is tied through, the manner in which the elites emerge/ formed, its history, and what it did, and everything is tied to Europe. B: Ah yes. I lived this very fact that our academic system umm is formed from the French one. The structure and the problems are about the same. I didn't notice big difference. Now certainly, when I went there, when I started to write.... I was at a certain level. I ran into new things that I would have encountered here too. ... So I learned them there directly, not here. But when I returned, I noticed that they corresponded, that there were no major differences.	Global/connection to Europe: teaching the Romanian language through its ties to Europe. French influence/ tradition on writing
Bogdan Țăra	There are colleagues whose discourse I find difficult to understand because they use so many English expressions and they are professors of Romanian. In a way, it is not bad to know but ... you give an ambiguous image about yourself because it is as if you are lacking in Romanian and do not know how to use it And this is why I tell my students: we use [English] but only when we do not have an equivalent or a perfect equivalent.	English lexis vs. Romanian Romanian language preferred—resists English imperialism

Participant	Transcript	Coding
Bogdan Țăra (continued)	But, I learned certain practices/ rituals from the French but I am also convinced that there are, knowing my professors here, those were old-school professors, that in writing any statement had to be an argument/ claim and those professors were formed in the German school primarily, and this meant precision and rigor.	Influence of the French The German influence/ tradition - old-school professors -argument/ claims/ “precision and rigor”
Dumitru Tucan	D: But, this is what could be called research paper [in English] as simple as that a research paper [in Romanian], that’s what we call it. Now, we have a terminology chaos. L: I see. D: In the Romanian context, precisely because of this lack of [writing] tradition. For instance, many call a paper that we ask students to write, a research paper, an original paper with all the key elements; others call it an essay. Well, in the Romanian context, we understand an essay to be something completely different, especially compared to those in the English dept. Others use generic terminology, those who work at the university; this is just a paper. I have to write a paper or something like that. Others call it referat. This name most likely comes from the Russian context.	“terminology chaos” (chaos in writing terminology) Romanian context—no writing tradition Research paper or essay or the generic paper. Different meanings. (traces this to the lack of tradition in the research and/ or teaching writing)
Dumitru Tucan	D: At some point, we discussed the structure of a research paper, we discussed about the moves and rhetorical moves. I believe that’s what Swales call them. L: Yes D: Pasi si miscari retorice.[Steps and rhetorical moves] L: So Swales was translated into Romanian? D: Well, he’s not translated into Romanian. He’s there in English. But here, it is something completely different, in essence, this MA course is a type of workshop. Evidently, I do a lecture at the beginning about umm the practices of writing in the Romanian modern culture.... And the problems with writing in the educational context—remember the earlier definition—have a lot to do with the French influence that was extremely powerful here and which, at a certain time configured educational institutions. It made it so that in Romania we wouldn’t discuss writing. In fact, writing is learned through imitation, including the bibliography....	Anglo-Saxon influence Rhetorical moves—Swales— Anglo-Saxon influence: - Swales read in English French influence powerful – - Influence on educational institutions - writing learned through imitation - writing was not discussed/ theorized

Participant	Transcript	Coding
	We had a series of workshops organized by UMM colleagues from a university in Giessen, Germany, with which we have a partnership; we are in our last, 5th year of the partnership. They held many workshops in Giessen and here, on diverse topics among which was academic writing. We have colleagues as Giessen who specialized in academic writing, scientific writing (he wrote a lot on this, many scholarly articles, Mr. Henish, a colleague got his doctorate in academic writing and this semester, he was here and he ran a workshop with a few modules with first and second-year students, and some students from the third year who were interested, to refresh their memory. “Most recently, Germany resembles very much the English and American tradition, so, yes, the British and the American. We too became more affiliated a bit with the larger model/ framework.” “But in the Romanian tradition/ model, there are still aspects that are different or in the French tradition, which is different, therefore we always discuss this thing [difference]. Certainly, situated in the larger context, in the German studies, we have a MA that is even called, “German in the European context: Inter and Multi-cultural Studies.	Workshops organized by colleagues in Germany A partnership of five years on several topics in including academic writing. Also visited and ran workshops for students as well. Students in the first and second year. Influence of the British and American schools French traditions still present. Studying German in the European context.