Mapping Transnational Institutions: Connections between WAC/WID and Qatar's Engineering Industry

Amy Hodges

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

To be completely honest, when I heard about a job opening in Qatar, I had to go find a map in order to locate what would become my new home. Located on a small peninsula in the Arabian Gulf, the nation of Qatar has been represented on maps in various ways throughout history. The earliest mention of the "Catara" region was in the collection *Geographia* by Claudius Ptolemy from the 2nd century C.E, which was later printed in 1478 in Rome by Conrad Swenheym, an apprentice of Johannes Gutenberg. Yet early cartographers did not often speak the dialects of Arabic used by the local people, and thus they misunderstood or mistranslated place names. Qatar was "Catura" on a 1782 French map, "Katar" on an 1865 British map, and "Catra," "Gattar," and "Cataragade" on other cartographic records. Western European explorers from 1596 to 1823 removed the peninsula from their maps entirely, showing instead a flat coastline. Differences in maps reflected the aims of empire-builders of Western Europe, impacting the decisions they made about trading with (or conquering) local Arabian tribes. Cartographers rarely acknowledged the limitations of their work, except for the refreshing note found on the 1782 map from Jean Baptiste Bourguignon d'Anville, which wryly notes that the Arabian Gulf is a "Coast little known."

Upon coming to Qatar and attempting to map the writing that was taking place in my new institution, I understood more clearly how this process could reveal my own misunderstandings and biases. In writing studies, we have more recently started to learn about the little known "coasts" of transnational institutions and the people within them. I use the term *transnational* in this chapter to emphasize the power of nation-states and other political actors in drawing up and moving between boundaries, including geographical, cultural, linguistic, ethnic, and other kinds of boundaries. The term *transnational*, with its associated terms *translingual*, *transcultural*, and *hybridization*, "reflects a system of dispositions that provides an alternative to the colonial and neocolonial ideologies reflected, respectively, in a monolingual and a multilingual approach" (Guerra & Shivers-McNair, 2017, p. 23). That is, *transnational* recognizes the very real presence of systems of power in institutions like the one I study in this chapter, but it also recognizes the pockets of resistance or complication within that system. As noted in this edited collection

and others (Martins, 2015), transnational writing programs are incredibly complex, both on a macro-level of leadership, bureaucracy, assessment, and placement, and on a micro-level of everyday interactions with students, faculty, staff, and other institutional actors.

Like the task of cartographers mapping the nation of Qatar, the task of writing researchers representing the "lay of the land" and the relationships inside and outside a transnational writing program is a challenging one. This chapter unpacks some of that complexity through the use of institutional ethnography, a method espoused by Michelle LaFrance and Melissa Nicolas (2012) as a critical approach to understanding writing programs' place(s) within institutional systems. They explain how the same institutional system can be experienced by different individuals with different perspectives:

> For example, a *university* is something about which we all share a general macro-level idea. But as soon as we move from this generalized view of the *university,* the screen gets fuzzy. A professor experiences *university* differently from the student, who experiences *university* differently from her parents, who, as well, experience *university* differently from the trustees. Even an individual's micro-level account of *university* changes over time: a first-year student has a different relationship with *university* than a senior, whose definition will change again after graduating. (LaFrance & Nicolas, 2012)

Institutional ethnography is a particularly useful method for transnational institutions in that it accounts for material conditions and previous experiences of the actors in the system, as well as the "far more complex trajectories of participation and identification" (LaFrance & Nicolas, 2012, p. 134) than can be adequately captured by the titles actors nominally assume in transnational institutions, such as "American faculty member" or "L2 student writer." Institutional ethnography "begins from the standpoint of those doing the work and zooms upward and outward" (Miley, 2017, p. 104), an approach that was helpful for me in attempting to "map out" my new transnational institution.

Recent scholarship in the US shows that many have adopted a goal of supporting "Multilingual Learning Across the Curriculum" (Hall, 2009, p. 37), and the question of how to best support L2 writers has been thoroughly documented. However, few have given attention to how WAC's best efforts can be unknowingly harmful to some multilingual and/or transnational students, as Michelle Cox (2011) wonders after surveying L2 literature on WAC:

> Is it possible that WAC administrators and scholars, like our colleagues in L2 writing studies and first year composition, place

the same overemphasis on writing? Have we paid more attention to the potential benefits of integrating writing into curricula than the possible costs to some students? If we are paying attention, what possible costs for L2 students should we be attending to? (p. 5)

Taking LeCourt's (2012) advice that "we might be better served by considering what the consequences of the changes we advocate will be rather than denying our role in such changes" (p. 83), in this chapter I map the consequences of my institution's WAC/WID program by considering the following research questions:

- In what ways do the experiences of engineering professionals in transnational workplaces reflect, resist, or hybridize existing approaches to WAC/WID?
- How might writing programs respond to these experiences and formulate a transnational and translingual WAC/WID approach?

After obtaining IRB approval in 2014, I interviewed working professionals who had graduated from my transnational institution about their experiences in the workplace and the connections they saw to the formal instruction they had received on writing and communication in dedicated English courses and engineering major courses. I conclude this chapter by reflecting on how I used this information to shape the WAC/WID program in a more responsive and localized manner.

Study Context

A. Suresh Canagarajah (2018) argues that "developing transnational identities . . . is an ideological project," a process that can be stimulated or advanced by living in transnational or multilingual spaces (p. 58). Although becoming a transnational subject can be accomplished in one's own home and/or among monolingual speakers, he describes how the liminal nature of transnational spaces can provide "scope for detachment from limiting language ideologies, connect writers with larger horizons for meaning making, identity construction, and writing, and facilitate the creativity that attempts to go beyond existing language systems and monolingual ideologies to construct new textual homes" (2018, p. 58). I experienced a similar process of understanding myself as a transnational subject, which in turn influenced my interpretation of the data in this study, so I explain more about my lived experience below.

After obtaining my Ph.D. and teaching composition and ESL classes in the US, I came to Qatar for two years as a postdoc. During that time, I worked on community literacy projects with students and began this study. I left to work at a writing center in an institution in Singapore for a year and then came back to

Qatar, where I lived for four more years. When I returned to Qatar as a faculty member, I resumed this study and began implementing WAC/WID programming. Throughout my time in transnational institutions, I talked with faculty who, like me, found their previous experience of teaching language and writing helpful but not quite sufficient to meet the needs of the students they saw in their classrooms. I talked with other well-meaning researchers who came over from the US with the intent of studying our student population, but whose methods and analysis seemed—to me—to inadequately represent the complexity of a transnational institution, and more importantly, to fail to account for indigenous principles of research that I felt were important to honor in this context: relationality, respect, and reciprocity (Wilson, 2008). I talked with students who allowed me into their rich worlds of meaning-making (Hodges & Rudd, 2014), and I talked with staff who did a lot of unseen and undervalued work with students to help them through the university. This process of mapping out the experience of transnational lives made me stop describing my own identity as simply American, simply an expatriate. I saw the ways in which, through listening and learning, I crossed boundaries and created a new transnational home and transnational identity for myself.

My study site and part of my transnational home, Texas A&M University at Qatar (TAMUQ), is an international branch campus (IBC) of Texas A&M University in the United States of America. Located in Doha, Qatar, TAMUQ, five other IBCs (Carnegie Mellon University in Qatar, Georgetown University in Qatar, Northwestern University in Qatar, Virginia Commonwealth University School of the Arts in Qatar, and Weill Cornell Medicine – Qatar), two European IBCs (University College London and HEC Paris), and a local university (Hamid bin Khalifa University) form a larger academic unit called Education City. These IBCs are fully supported by the Qatar Foundation, a government entity founded by His Highness the Father Emir Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al Thani and Her Highness Sheikha Moza bint Nasser (Qatar Foundation, 2019). Their daughter Her Excellency Sheikha Hind bint Hamad bin Khalifa Al Thani serves as the current Vice Chairperson and CEO of Qatar Foundation.

Each IBC offers specialized undergraduate degrees; for example, TAMUQ provides four B.S. degrees: chemical, mechanical, petroleum, or electrical and computer engineering. These degrees follow the same curriculum of the main American institutions, meaning, in TAMUQ's case, that Doha students are required to take American history and American local and state government courses just like College Station students are required to take these courses by the state legislature back in Texas. The promise made to students that they will receive an education that is a replica of the main campus is extended even to the printed degrees students receive upon matriculation, which say "Texas A&M University," with no mention of the location of the campus. Professionals in student life replicate or adapt traditions common to the College Station experience, and make a "targeted, intentional

effort . . . to educate both students and employees about institutional values, history, and tradition" (Wood, 2011, p. 38). In light of these facts, it might look as if Texas A&M packed up elements of their institution in a shipping container and plopped the whole thing in the Arabian desert, and indeed, American IBCs like those in Education City have been criticized for their thinly disguised neo-colonialist goals and reinforcement of existing inequalities between different academic systems (Altbach, 2004).

But however strong the replication on the surface, the inherent "messiness" of a transnational system defies simple logics of an export model of higher education, where all of the people in the system adopt the values of the exporting country. I agree with anthropologist Neha Vora's view that "what we see in branch campuses instead is that the university is more of a network, a complex apparatus whose channels carry more than the putatively universal values we associate with it" (Vora, 2015, p. 32). Some students embraced Texas A&M traditions, others ignored them, and yet others met them on their own terms (Rudd, 2018). Faculty members, many of whom shared ethnic or religious backgrounds with the students, frequently discussed with me how they were adapting courses and assignments for our students, sometimes in spite of or in opposition to what they perceived as "mandates" from the main campus.

The engineering faculty I met at TAMUQ also had a different factor guiding their pedagogical decisions than the faculty at main campus: Qatar's engineering industry. The majority of our students with Qatari citizenship (roughly half the student population) were sponsored by local companies for their degree, and thus would go on to work for these companies upon graduation. A significant portion of the other half of the students were residents (non-citizens) who, under the *kafala* laws common in the Arabian Gulf region, needed to have a job upon graduation in order to stay in Qatar. Because most of the resident students were children of expatriates and had grown up in Qatar or other countries in the region, they often had family members in Doha and expressed a wish to stay in the country they regarded as home. However, if resident students did not find employment in Qatar upon graduation, they would potentially have to leave their families and return to their country of origin or passport, which could be a country that they had rarely or never lived in before. Thus, the transnational space of the institution itself intersected with students' citizenship and ethnic heritage; these factors all shaped how students perceived their future role in Qatar's engineering industry.

The pressure to have graduates "work-ready" coincided with the American university structures of the IBC to support student writing in a way that will feel familiar to many U.S. writing program administrators. As "exported" from the main campus engineering curriculum, the writing program consisted of a first-year writing course, a technical and business writing course, and two writing-intensive course requirements. At the time of the study, students took one

engineering and ethics course that was writing-intensive, and then they also took one upper-level writing-intensive course in their specific engineering major. Like many WAC/WID programs, a committee approved the writing-intensive course designation. Founded by Texas A&M's then-writing center director Valerie Balester in 2003 (Texas A&M University Writing Center, 2003), the writing-intensive course system provided a strong structure for graduates to become excellent communicators.

Because the curriculum at TAMUQ was the same as main campus, the requirements for writing-intensive courses were also the same. What this meant for TAMUQ engineering faculty is that faculty members in their department on main campus might write course descriptions, describe assignments and feedback procedures in their writing-intensive course application, get the writing-intensive course designation approved—all before faculty at TAMUQ were informed about any changes to the curriculum, learning objectives, or course requirements. Additionally, faculty at the main campus almost certainly did not have in mind a student population who hailed almost entirely from the Middle East, North Africa, and South Asia regions (see Kwon, this volume, for more on challenges faced by engineering faculty implementing WAC). Thus, while the writing-intensive course systems at TAMUQ provided a sound, American-centric base for writing instruction in the disciplines, other faculty members' experiences suggested to me that the program had not adapted for its new home in a transnational space. The purpose of this writing program research was instrumental (Hesse, 2012) in that one of my goals was to shape the campus conversation on writing towards mindsets and abilities that were useful to *our* student population, which might or might not be supported by these American-centered systems.

WAC/WID in the Middle East – North Africa Region

A central tenet of WAC/WID programs is that they "develop for various reasons and may take many different forms" (International Network of WAC Programs, 2014, p. 2). William Condon and Carol Rutz (2012) note that although WAC philosophies and practices are prevalent in higher education, "WAC as a phenomenon does not possess a single, identifiable structure; instead it varies in its development and its manifestation from campus to campus" (p. 358). While this variation has proved troublesome to some researchers hoping for a more "global" model of writing in higher education, WAC's ability to localize can be a powerful tool for transnational institutions. By combining localized practices (particularly language practices) with global scope, emerging writing programs in the Middle East/North Africa (MENA) region offer great potential to formulate a transnational and translingual approach to WAC/WID.

Few English-medium institutions in the MENA region have a designated WAC/WID program; most rely upon writing centers to provide assistance for faculty and students beyond English courses. Writing centers in English-medium institutions tend to focus on support for the first few years of university, when many students (particularly those without experience in English as a language of instruction) are challenged by the transition into academic English (Ronesi, 2011). In IBCs, writing faculty members (often trained in the US) can serve as unofficial WAC/WID specialists who take the lead in adapting assignments and curricula for students, who have often learned in diverse and different educational systems (Weber, et al., 2015). By drawing upon local educational cultures, experienced writing instructors, and American writing program structures such as writing centers, these transnational institutions create new hybrids of WAC/WID programming. As researchers at Carnegie Mellon University in Qatar have noted, "influence within a transnational program need not flow from the 'main' campus only, but rather should be constructed through dynamic, negotiated interactions" (Zawodny Wetzel & Reynolds, 2015, p. 100).

As compared to IBCs, "turnkey institutions" in the MENA region are those universities that originally developed as a collaboration with a foreign institution or government, but over which the local administrators have taken formal control (Miller-Idriss & Hanauer, 2011). Although the name, original curriculum, and accreditation of turnkey institutions are often American, the emphasis on local control also means that these institutions have considerable leeway for creating new models for WAC/WID. At the American University of Beirut, Amy Zenger et al. (2014) detail how their assumptions changed as they worked with students in their English 300 course, a course for graduate students writing in their disciplines. The authors adopted new roles of "literacy brokers" as they invited students' multilingual abilities into the classroom and assigned tasks that encouraged "students' understanding of writing as a social act, rather than a set of discrete skills" (2014, p. 427). This experience led them to build the WAC/WID program at the American University of Beirut on a transnational praxis: asking first what students and faculty know about their languages and disciplines before imposing their own assumptions about writing or English. MENA faculty and students who experience teaching and learning in a translingual and transnational context are changed as a result of that experience. We may not always agree with these changes or think that they will benefit students; for example, a transnational student with a rich and diverse multilingual background may, during her university career, develop a prescriptive approach towards language out of a belief that her future career depends upon her English proficiency. As I document later in this chapter, I encountered some similar, unsettling consequences of my institution's WAC/WID program in alumni perceptions of translanguaging.

The emerging transnational and translingual approach to WAC/WID in the MENA region presumes that the languages in use, such as Arabic and English,

"can be understood as cultural conduits that [are] anything but unidirectional" (Arnold, 2014, p. 286). Although different languages, pedagogical methods, and writing program structures are subject to and part of institutional systems of power, the interaction between these elements provides a creative space for transnational WAC/WID approaches to flourish. Through investigating the impact of writing and communication in engineering courses on local alumni, I hoped to have a deeper understanding of the particular nature of transnational WAC/WID at my institution.

Methods

To study the connections between the writing in Qatar's engineering industry and the writing in the WAC/WID program at TAMUQ, I gathered two sets of data: interviews with alumni of the institution and learning objectives in the syllabi from students' engineering courses.

Alumni Interviews

After IRB approval, the alumni office at TAMUQ identified recent graduates who might be interested in participating in a research project regarding their experiences with workplace communication. Ten interviews were conducted over the course of 2014–2016, and each interview lasted around 30 minutes. Undergraduate researchers conducted all of these interviews primarily in English, although I was always in the room and occasionally asked a follow-up question. A list of questions is available in Appendix A, and a list of participants is in Appendix B.

Three out of 10 interviewees were female, which is fewer than the usual gender balance of TAMUQ, where the percentage of female students ranges between 45–50% in any given year. Half of the interviewees were Qatari, which is representative of the student body population, although all of the Qatari interviewees were male. The other interviewees self-identified as belonging to different ethnic and national communities in South Asia and the Middle East, including the countries of Pakistan, India, and Jordan.

After the interviews, the recorded data was transcribed and all identifying information removed. The transcripts were then uploaded to Dedoose, a qualitative research software. After reading the transcripts multiple times, I employed inductive and deductive coding (Purcell-Gates, 2011), looking specifically for where interviewees compared their work experiences to their university training in communication, but also allowing for new themes to emerge from the data. During the entire course of coding, I collaborated with the undergraduate researchers who conducted the interviews, discussed the emerging themes with them, and revised

the codes based on their feedback. The themes are presented below in the results and discussion section.

Learning Outcomes for Engineering Courses

In this study, I used a selection of course learning outcomes (LOs) to represent the main campus's American goals for engineering communication. All institutions no doubt experience discrepancies between LOs and the actual teaching practices and student learning that occurs in any given course. Thus, it is perhaps more realistic to view these LOs as goals or ideals rather than the lived experiences that formed the alumni interview dataset. These LOs were required to be consistent across campuses, and they were developed by departments on main campus, although it is possible that some departments collaborated with faculty on the Qatar campus on LOs. I included learning outcomes from all engineering courses in order to capture communication goals that were not part of explicitly designated writing-intensive courses.

All syllabi were obtained for undergraduate engineering courses (mechanical, chemical, petroleum, and electrical and computer engineering) offered in Qatar during the fall 2016 and spring 2017 semesters from the public TAMUQ system website. Overall, there were 103 engineering courses and 807 learning outcomes to analyze, as seen in Appendix C.

In the first pass at the learning outcomes corpus, I developed a coding system based on how relevant each individual learning outcome was to student learning of communication skills. I excluded all outcomes that explicitly referenced mathematical problem-solving, such as "characterize an LTI system using the impulse response, frequency response, and (if possible) a linear constant coefficient differential equation." These outcomes were unlikely to be assessed through communication assignments, and were, therefore, unlikely to impact the developing WAC/WID program.

The second category of learning outcomes was those that explicitly referenced a communication assignment or reading/writing abilities, such as "deliver an accurate and effective ten-minute oral presentation on a technical topic" and "search and gather information from the library and other resources on specific topics." The final major category was learning outcomes that did not explicitly reference communication but that could potentially be assessed through assignments that employed writing to learn, writing in the disciplines, or communication in the disciplines methodologies. The examples from the dataset often employed terminology such as "describe the factors that affect the heating and cooling loads of buildings" and "evaluate uncertainty in reserve estimates and economic appraisal." Many of the LOs in this category focused on discipline-specific knowledge; if used, writing or communication would have been a means to teaching that knowledge.

This early analysis was used to sort learning outcomes into categories that could be compared to the themes in the interview data. Inter-rater reliability was 86%

with the first coder and 90% with a second coder, both acceptable ranges for a large corpus (Miles et al., 2014). Sixty-nine LOs (8.5% of the total number of LOs) explicitly referenced communication and/or writing, 162 LOs (20%) were categorized as potential sources of WAC/WID programming, and the remaining 576 LOs focused on quantitative knowledge or were excluded from the analysis because they were unclear. These categories were used to triangulate the data from the interviews and determine what communication knowledge could be traced back to their experience as an undergraduate.

Results and Discussion

Once both sets of data were coded, I looked for important differences between the experiences of alumni in Qatar's engineering industry and the writing and communication goals for engineering students that my transnational institution was supposed to abide by. Below, I unpack the key themes of my analysis and explore the potential for transnational and translingual WAC/WID programs.

Rhetoric and Genre

The first theme that emerged from the interview data was the professionals' rhetorical understanding of genre. In the interviews, alumni mentioned that their employers expected them to compose, develop, and provide feedback on the following workplace communication genres:

- Email Messages
- Excel Documents
- Executive Summaries
- HAZOPs (Hazard and Operability Study)
- Letters
- Meeting Minutes and Summaries
- Memos
- Newsletters
- Presentations
- Progress Reports
- Proposals
- Recommendation Reports
- Sales Reports
- Technical Reports

When asked about how they composed these genres, the professionals mentioned using templates or previous documents composed at the company, but they stressed

that these templates were used rhetorically and adapted to fit their purpose and situation. For example, Riya used previous Excel sheets to analyze sales data from her company: "It's the same template, but the content is different every time, so considerable time has to be spent on summarizing the findings and go deeper into analysis if need be." In the oil and gas industry, Tariq also used templates as a starting point to supply parts to reservoirs: "I never actually follow one template and go, 'All right, this is it,' but I try my best to summarize what I can in the memo and then try to forward any questions back to me if I missed anything." Working in a process safety role, Ammar described how he needed to "kind of amalgamate the different proposals and synthesize it into one document to best convey what you're trying to achieve. So a lot of times it's just taking a lot of stuff and manipulating it to make it seem coherent and in line with what you're doing." These professionals' writing processes illustrate how engineering communicators can explicitly discuss their rhetorical practices with workplace genres (Leydens, 2008).

Alumni consistently advised their undergraduate interviewers to think about their audience, situation, purpose, and linguistic choices each time they took on a new communication task. As Ali, who worked for a government ministry, noted, this rhetorical purpose extended also to the writer's place in the larger system: "So you have to also consider your audience, consider the place you are in, and consider also your level, because at this time I was an engineer; now I'm a director, so I have to pick my words carefully." This understanding of a writer's place within an institution or system and the power that the writer accumulates or loses through their writing in that system (Seawright, 2017) were evident in alumni interviews.

In the learning outcomes, the most common genres mentioned were written examinations, technical reports, oral presentations, and lab reports and their requisite parts (introduction, methods, results, discussion). Very few referenced specific genres, and the following genres were mentioned in only one LO each:

- Product Specification Sheets
- Interface Control Documents
- Professional and Legal Codes
- Problem Statement
- Work Breakdown Structure
- Manufacturers' Data Sheets
- Proposal
- Literature Review
- Process Design Report

When LOs mentioned the composition process, the goal of the student was not to analyze and respond to a particular rhetorical situation but to produce a document, such as "Compose an accurate and effective two-page written report on a technical topic." In contract to the professionals' thoughtful consideration of audience, the

audience mentioned in the LOs was often unspecified, as in one course, students were expected to develop the "ability to present ideas, prepare technical presentations, and effectively communicate with the audience."

The arhetorical stance implied by many LOs may be reflective of Dan Melzer's (2014) findings that many disciplinary writing assignments used in U.S. universities feature the professor as the only audience. It is also possible that the writers of these LOs feared imposing too much on their fellow faculty members who would be teaching the course in the future, and they wanted to allow for diverse approaches towards communication goals. Regardless, in my interviews TAMUQ alumni exhibited a nuanced understanding of rhetorical writing and familiarity with business communication genres, yet these abilities did not seem to have manifested from the institution's disciplinary writing requirements.

This finding indicates that workplace-oriented transnational WAC/WID programs should include an emphasis on rhetorical genre studies and on the rhetorical nature of translanguaging (Bloom-Pojar, 2018). Because writing is a socially mediated act and genres operate within and across cultures, transnational students could benefit from instruction focused on rhetorical adaptability. From experience, TAMUQ alumni seemed to have learned how to analyze their writing situation and to compose for particular workplace audiences. They may have had an easier transition to Qatar's engineering industry if their disciplinary writing education had more rhetorical approaches to writing and rhetorically-situated tasks.

Language

All of the interviewees indicated that they were more comfortable writing in English than in their mother tongues and other languages they had learned, and they often expressed that this preference was not something they had anticipated before entering university or the workplace. Most of the native Arabic speakers felt more comfortable speaking in Arabic or felt that they were equally comfortable speaking in both English and Arabic. This shift towards becoming more comfortable writing in English was often directly tied to their post-graduate work life, as Hamad indicated that his English was stronger because of the "time I spent out in the States and Norway [for work as a process engineer] because basically that's what I've been using."

The primacy of English in the interviewees' transnational workplaces extended even to audiences of Arabic speakers, as when Ali discussed writing reports for his boss, a minister in the government: "Now I do most of my reports in English and I submit it to His Excellency in English, even though I know we're both Arabic speakers." In January 2019, several years after these interviews were conducted, His Highness the Amir of Qatar passed a law to protect the Arabic language; among other things, the law stipulates that Arabic should be the official language of

government meetings, discussions, and correspondence (Tribune News Network, 2019). More research is needed to determine the impact of this law on the language practices of working professionals in Qatar's engineering industry.

Interviewees identified "technical terms" as one of the key reasons they used English instead of Arabic. For Ali, writing for a minister in the government, "if I'm going to discuss this matter with someone from a different country, then if I'm used to using the same terms, it's easier for me to negotiate or to say it." As a project manager, Saad had a similar experience, saying, "Sometimes we meet four or five people and it will be all Arabic-speaking people, but we always talk in English and always do the minutes of the meeting in English. The emails are always in English because all of the terms or the technical terms are in English, as well, so you can't really jump between Arabic and English." Although Abdullah, in the oil and gas industry, mentioned that he occasionally had to write email replies in Arabic, he also emphasized how he preferred to present in English, because "it's much easier because I know the technical terms, while in Arabic I have to translate it and I stutter when I'm speaking."

These views were perhaps influenced by my presence as an American English professor, but because I was present, I could observe that translanguaging between Arabic and English took place before, during, and after these interviews. The written transcripts include our small talk where some interviewees spoke with the undergraduates in Arabic. When interviewees expressed appreciation for their achievements, they thanked God (*alhumdilah*), and they occasionally dipped into Arabic to express an idea or concept. Only Hassan, who worked as an electrical engineer, talked about the presence of languages besides English at the workplace: "English will be the official language; of course, if someone is comfortable speaking something else, off the record or unofficially that person will be speaking that language."

Unsurprisingly, none of the learning outcomes in the engineering courses mention the use of languages other than English. Several indicate that students' written or spoken language should be clear, concise, and correct, which indicates prevalent language ideologies about standardized American English. One petroleum engineering LO indicated that students should be able to communicate "the fundamental forms of ownership of petroleum resources, and laws, fiscal systems and financial interests pertinent to their exploitation in the United States *and internationally*" (emphasis mine), and we can only suppose that international discourse over petroleum resources could potentially involve other languages. The lack of reference to different language forms in the LOs reflects the monolingual "face" that many WAC/WID programs or educational institutions may present. It is a possibility that some of the alumni may have internalized these language ideologies about the importance of English, given their preference for using that language. Further analysis will need to be done to determine more about the professional engineers' experience with translanguaging between English and Arabic and within English itself.

However, as Jerry Won Lee and Christopher Jenks (2016) note, "translingual dispositions, like English, are multifaceted and reflect students' varied and evolving lives" (p. 340), and at the time of the interviews, alumni may not have attributed their success at work to their knowledge of languages other than English. It is also possible that moving back and forth between English and Arabic—as the interviewees did throughout the interview—is simply so normal that it did not occur to the professionals to mention it. Lee (2016) has argued that "continuing to view translingual writing as 'different' runs the risk of it being further marginalized or exoticized" (p. 186), and the unmarked status of Arabic and other mother tongues could be a feature of these former students' translingual dispositions. It is worth mentioning that Arabic is a diglossic language, with most speakers using both a dialect (*khaleeji* in Qatar) and *fusha*, or Modern Standard Arabic. Thus, alumni articulated a complicated perspective that both overlooked translanguaging and utilized it at the same time.

For transnational WAC/WID institutions, this finding may reflect language ideologies that position non-English languages as "unofficial" or "colloquial," in contrast to the official and prestigious status of English. Students and faculty may resist or ignore explicit calls to encourage translanguaging, a reminder that "transnational writing education is ethical and ideological work" (You, 2018, p. 2). But on the other hand, those looking at the institution from the outside may wrongly conclude that English primacy is the only translingual disposition espoused by those within. Instead, perceptions of language are constantly evolving, and no actor is left unchanged by interaction with others in a transnational and translingual space. Even in English-medium institutions, "reintroducing into existing writing curricula, pedagogies, and assessments English in its full complexity and depth" (Bou Ayash, 2019, p. 50) and considering local contexts for writing (Shamsuzzaman, this volume) are potential ways for WAC/WID programs to mitigate the consequences of language ideologies.

Formal Instruction on Writing in Major Courses

Alumni were very positive about their university training for the workplace, and many of the experiences they mentioned as impactful included engineering professors who provided professional training in communication. Riya fondly remembered a course with a chemical engineering professor who "taught us about the skills to use PowerPoint, Excel, Word. This may seem basic, but he taught us some really great shortcuts or some really effective tools to make our work faster and easier." This professor "really worked on our grammar, our language, our diction, and presentation skills."

Others thought that it would have been helpful to integrate communication skills more thoroughly into their engineering major courses (see Li, this volume).

When asked if he could have used more training in writing, Ali said

> I don't think we did enough writing in the engineering courses
> because most of our assignments were very technical problems
> and solving those problems was mostly with numbers. . . . It's
> not having more courses of English, it's incorporating those
> English skills into your engineering courses.

When alumni reflected on their opportunity to practice communication skills, they recalled focusing on how to get the grade they wanted; Tariq joked that he thought his reports were graded according to weight. In contrast to the thoughtful way they were able to draw connections between their workplace writing situations, alumni reported that when they were students, they saw each writing task as taking place in its own unique situation. For example, Maryam explained that she completed each lab report with little reference to previous lab reports:

> Each course would have a different instruction sometimes, so it's
> not something common for all the process. Some chemistry lab
> reports are different than electric circuits lab reports. It's differ-
> ent. And we all, like for each course, we used to get the training
> to write this specific lab report.

The lack of transfer between different assignments and the missing connections between engineering and writing courses likely meant that alumni pieced together this knowledge on the job.

While some alumni suggested that explicit teaching of business communication genres such as meeting minutes and emails would be helpful—which is true—the larger point is that the current WAC/WID program did not help students articulate connections between their previous writing knowledge and the task and situation at hand (see Donahue, this volume, for linguists' contributions that could illuminate future WAC/WID transfer research). As Juan Guerra (2016) notes, in translingual teaching "what we want instead is for [students] to call on the rhetorical sensibilities many of them already possess but put aside because of what they see as a jarring shift in context" (pp. 231-232). Alumni perceived that when they were students, the contexts and the "rules" for writing were too distinct for transfer between courses.

Conclusion

Alumni generally observed that their training in communication at the IBC adequately prepared them for their work on the job, although the transition was not without its challenges. Hamad traced his success back to his ability developed at TAMUQ to adapt and learn in new situations:

> But again, TAMUQ is actually teaching you the right skills that
> would make you adapt to this kind of communication style in
> industry. How is that? That's basically they're teaching you how
> to learn. That's something I've been seeing here every day almost,
> that every day you learn something new and you just have to
> keep learning, adapting to the new challenges.

This rhetorical flexibility is closely aligned with multilingual rhetorical attune-
ment, or "how multilingual writers negotiate and adapt to language multiplicity,
but also . . . emergent, unstable multilingual practices" (Lorimer Leonard, 2014,
p. 231). Because of (and despite) the IBC's American goals for engineering com-
munication, these multilingual writers/engineers displayed an ability to adapt to
communication in challenging and diverse workplaces. For Hamad and other in-
terviewees, the transnational lived environment of the writers and the institution
supported the development of flexible, rhetorically attuned engineers—a key out-
come of most technical and professional writing programs.

Transnational institutions highlight both the potential and the challenges of
existing approaches to WAC/WID programs, as well as the inevitable slippage be-
tween institutional and course policies and the lived experiences of student writers.
Institutions worldwide import learning outcomes and writing program structures
in an effort to support student writers during and after their time at the univer-
sity. Adopting, implementing, and assessing these learning outcomes can certainly
benefit students, and as shown in my study, can adequately prepare them for tech-
nical communication tasks in a diverse workplace. At the same time, this chapter
suggests that the lived experiences of transnational students-turned-professionals
lead them to continuously invent their own new rhetorical knowledge of genre and
language and develop a flexible mindset towards communication that enables them
to do their jobs. This conclusion is an admittedly positive outlook on the conse-
quences of exporting American WAC/WID to the Arabian Gulf in the form of
arhetorical learning outcomes for writing and communication. The map of trans-
national WAC/WID programs contains many such "fossils of American academic
tourists' dreams" (see Sharma and Hammond, this volume), and it is a testament to
the ingenuity, intelligence, and resilience of our students that they picked up these
fossils and used them in service of their own goals as people and professionals.

I initially wrote this chapter and used its findings to advocate for a WAC/
WID coordinator in TAMUQ's newly formed Center for Teaching and Learning.
Positioned as an arm of faculty development and support for teaching innovation,
I was able to talk with other faculty about the use of writing in their classes and to
heighten awareness of the importance of connecting engineering to professional
communication. We often discussed what I learned from these engineering profes-
sionals, and faculty shared what they have learned from their alumni interactions

and advisory boards. Like Zenger et al. (2014), I anchored the WAC/WID program in a transnational praxis that asks first what students and faculty know about languages and disciplinary structures.

In fall 2019, I piloted a Writing-Enriched Curriculum (WEC) model for engineering (Durfee et al., 2011) that encouraged engineering departments to reach out to former students for their input. By developing plans for writing and communication specific to our campus, engineering departments would be tasked with localizing faculty development, student learning support, and communication learning outcomes that are responsive to the needs of alumni and Qatar's engineering industry. As an effort to reverse the "export" model of learning outcomes for writing, this WEC program held great promise (Anson et al., in press) but was tabled when the COVID-19 pandemic hit Qatar in February 2020 and I left TAMUQ in June 2020. For all of my regrets in leaving, I was thrilled to see that my colleague Dr. Naqaa Abbas would be continuing the WAC position and adding her vision and skillsets in writing, language, and cultural awareness.

Mapping and remapping the (dis)connections between writing outcomes and writers' workplaces illuminates new knowledge for transnational WAC/WID practitioners to act upon and use as leverage for institutional change, but it also reveals our participation in the act of naming, owning, and claiming the existing landscape of writing. Before I came to live and work in Qatar, my transnational students were already living experiences that taught them strategies of rhetorical communication and writing. By seeking out local knowledge and ethically incorporating it into institutional writing structures, transnational WAC/WID programs can provide meaningful learning opportunities and attempt to mitigate consequences of our map-making.

Acknowledgments

References

Altbach, Philip. G. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management, 10*(1), 3-25.

Anson, Chris, Hodges, Amy, & Rudd, Mysti. (in press). The writing-enriched curriculum: Transnational prospects and challenges. In Christiane Donahue & Bruce Horner (Eds.), *Teaching and studying transnational composition*. Modern Language Association.

Arnold, Lisa. (2014). "The worst part of the dead past": Language attitudes, policies, and pedagogies at Syrian Protestant College, 1866–1902. *College Composition and Communication, 66*(2), 276-300.

Bloom-Pojar, Rachel. (2018). *Translanguaging outside the academy: Negotiating rhetoric and healthcare in the Spanish Carribean*. National Council of Teachers of English.

Bou Ayash, Nancy. (2019). *Toward translingual realities in composition: (Re)Working local language representations and practices*. Utah State University Press.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. (2018). Transnationalism and translingualism: How they are connected. In X. You (Ed.), *Transnational writing education: Theory, history, and practice* (pp. 41-60). Routledge.

Condon, William., & Rutz, Carol. (2012). A taxonomy of writing across the curriculum programs: Evolving to serve broader agendas. *College Composition and Communication, 64*(2), 357-382.

Conrad, Susan. (2017). A comparison of practitioner and student writing in civil engineering. *Journal of Engineering Education, 106*(2), 191-217.

Cox, Michelle. (2011). WAC: Closing doors or opening doors for second language writers? *Across the Disciplines, 8*(4). https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.4.20

Donahue, Christiane. (2009). "Internationalization" and composition studies: Reorienting the discourse. *College Composition and Communication, 61*(2), 212-243.

Durfee, William K., Adams, Benjamin, Appelsies, Audrey J., & Flash, Pamela. (2011, June 26–June 29). *A writing program for mechanical engineering*. Presented at the American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

Ferris, Dana, & Thaiss, Chris. (2011). Writing at UC Davis: Addressing the needs of second language writers. *Across the Disciplines, 8*(4). https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.4.27

Guerra, Juan C. (2016). Cultivating a rhetorical sensibility in the translingual writing classroom. *College English, 78*(3), 226-233.

Guerra, Juan C., & Shivers-McNair, Ann. (2017). Toward a new vocabulary of motive: Re(con)figuring entanglement in a translingual world. In Bruce Horner & Elliot Tetreault (Eds.), *Crossing divides: Exploring translingual writing pedagogies and programs* (pp. 19-30). Utah State University Press.

Hall, Jonathan. (2009). WAC/WID in the next America: Redefining professional identity in the age of the multilingual majority. *The WAC Journal, 20*, 33-49. https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2009.20.1.03

Hesse, Doug. (2012). Writing program research: Three analytic axes. In Lee Nickolson & Mary P. Sheridan (Eds.), *Writing studies research in practice: Methods and methodologies* (pp. 140-157). Southern Illinois University Press.

Hodges, Amy, & Rudd, Mysti. (2014). Teaching plagiarism IS teaching culture. In Leslie Seawright (Ed.), *Going global: Transnational perspectives on globalization, language, and education* (pp. 192-217). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

International Network of WAC Programs. (2014). Statement of WAC principles and practices. https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/principles/statement.pdf

LaFrance, Michelle, & Nicolas, Melissa. (2012). Institutional ethnography as materialist framework for writing program research and the faculty-staff work standpoints project. *College Composition and Communication, 64*(1), 130-150.

LeCourt, Donna. (2012). WAC as critical pedagogy: The third stage? In Terry Myers Zawacki & Paul M. Rogers (Eds.), *Writing across the curriculum: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 69-84). Bedford/St. Martin's.

Lee, Jerry Won. (2016). Beyond translingual writing. *College English, 79*(2), 174-195.

Lee, Jerry Won, & Jenks, Christopher. (2016). Doing translingual dispositions. *College Composition and Communication, 68*(2), 317-344.

Leydens, Jon 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.

Lorimer Leonard, Rebecca Lorimer. (2014). Multilingual writing as rhetorical attunement. *College English, 76*(3), 227-247.

Male, Sally A., Bush, Mark B., & Chapman, Elaine S. (2010). Perceptions of competency deficiencies in engineering graduates. *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education, 16*(1), 55-67.

Martins, David S. (Ed.). (2015). *Transnational writing program administration*. Utah State University Press.

Melzer, Dan. (2014). Assignments across the curriculum: A national study of college writing. Utah State University Press.

Miles, Matthew B., Huberman, A. Michael, & Saldaña, Jonny. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (Vol. 3)*. Sage Publications.

Miley, Michelle. (2017). Looking up: Mapping writing center work through institutional ethnography. *Writing Center Journal, 36*(1), 103-129.

Miller-Idriss, Cynthia, & Hanauer, Elizabeth. (2011). Transnational higher education: Offshore campuses in the Middle East. *Comparative Education, 47*(2), 181-207.

Patton, Martha D. (2011). Mapping the gaps in services for L2 writers. *Across the Disciplines, 8*(4). https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.4.26

Purcell-Gates, Victoria. (2011). Ethnographic research. In Nell K. Duke & Marla H. Mallette (Eds.), *Literacy research methodologies* (pp. 135-154). Guilford Press.

Qatar Foundation. (2019). About Qatar Foundation. https://www.qf.org.qa/about

Ronesi, Lynne. (2011). "Striking while the iron is hot": A writing fellows program supporting lower-division courses at an American university in the UAE. *Across the Disciplines, 8*(4). https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.4.25

Rudd, Mysti. (2018). "It makes us even angrier than we already are": Listening rhetorically to students' responses to an honor code imported to a transnational university in the Middle East. *Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies, and Emerging Pedagogies, 4*(3), 655-674.

Seawright, Leslie. (2017, March 15–18). *Genre of power: Police report writers and readers in the justice system.* Conference on College Composition and Communication; National Council of Teachers of English, Portland, Oregon, United States.

Shuck, Gail. (2006). Combating monolingualism: A novice administrator's challenge. *WPA: Writing Program Administration, 30*(1-2), 59-82.

Texas A&M University Writing Center. (2003). Faculty Senate Resolution 20.108. https://writingcenter.tamu.edu/Faculty/W-C-Course-Facts/Faculty-Senate-Resolution-20-108

Tribune News Network. (2019, January 15). Amir issues law to promote and protect Arabic language. http://www.qatar-tribune.com/news-details/id/152201

Vora, Neha. (2015). Is the university universal? Mobile (re)constitutions of American academia in the Gulf Arab States. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 46*(1), 19-36.

Weber, Alan S., Golkowska, Krystyna, Miller, Ian, Sharkey, Rodney, Rishel, Mary Ann, & Watts, Autumn. (2015). The First-year writing seminar program at Weill Cornell Medical College – Qatar: Balancing tradition, culture, and innovation in transnational writing instruction. In David. S. Martins (Ed.), *Transnational writing program administration* (pp. 72-92). Utah State University Press.

Wilson, Shawn. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood.

Wood, Cynthia H. (2011). Institutional ethos: Replicating the student experience. *New Directions for Higher Education, 155*, 29-39.

You, Xiaoye. (2018). Introduction: Making a transnational turn in writing education. In X. You (Ed.), *Transnational writing education: Theory, history, and practice* (pp. 1-17). Routledge.

Zawodny Wetzel, Danielle, & Reynolds, Dudley. (2015). Adaption across space and time: Revealing pedagogical assumptions. In David. S. Martins (Ed.), *Transnational writing program administration* (pp. 93-116). Utah State University Press.

Zenger, Amy, Mullin, Joan, & Haviland, Carol P. (2014). Reconstructing teacher roles through a transnational lens: Learning with/in the American University of Beirut. In Terry Myers Zawacki & Michelle Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second-language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 415-437). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551.2.17

Appendix A: Interview Questions

1. What kind of writing are you doing for your job right now? Who is the audience for this writing? How much writing do you do for oral presentation purposes?

2. Can you walk me through the process, from beginning to end, of how you completed X? When you sat down at your laptop to write X, did you start typing at the beginning of the document? How did you decide on this process?

3. Have you been asked to do this kind of writing before? Did you write X when you were in undergraduate or graduate school? Did you do any writing in your science or engineering classes? Where did you receive training on how to do this kind of writing?

4. Did you expect coming into this profession that you would be doing this amount of writing?

5. How much time (percentage) do you spend writing every day?

6. How much of your writing for your job is written by groups of people? Do

you enjoy these types of projects? Why or why not? How many people contribute to the final form of this document?

7. What language(s) do you write in and speak in? Do you speak any other languages besides (the languages you mentioned earlier)? Do you use these languages often when you are working?
8. Can you think of an example of when your writing was particularly effective or ineffective?
9. What kind of training on writing did you receive as part of your formal education (secondary school and/or university and or postsecondary)? How did it help you or not help you?
10. What kind of support do you receive for your own writing now that you're out of TAMUQ?
11. What writing habits should our engineering students develop now that will help them in their future profession? What advice would you offer to them with regards to writing? What can TAMUQ do to better support these kinds of writing experiences?

Appendix B: Alumni Participants in Interviews

Pseudonym	Gender	B.S. Degree Received from TAMUQ*	Spoken and Written Languages
Abdullah	M	CHEN	Arabic, English, some Spanish and French
Ali	M	ECEN	Arabic, English
Ammar	M	MEEN	English, Urdu
Dana	F	ECEN	Arabic, English, some French
Hamad	M	PETE	Arabic, English, Norwegian
Hassan	M	ECEN	Urdu, English, some Arabic
Maryam	F	ECEN	Arabic, English
Riya	F	CHEN	English, unidentified "mother tongue"
Saad	M	Unknown	Unknown
Tariq	M	MEEN	Arabic, English, some French

CHEN (Chemical Engineering); ECEN (Electrical and Computer Engineering); MEEN (Mechanical Engineering); PETE (Petroleum Engineering)

Appendix C. Learning Outcomes from Engineering Courses

Department	Number of Courses Offered in 2016–2017 Academic Year	Number of Total Learning Outcomes on Syllabi
Mechanical Engineering	27*	259
Electrical and Computer Engineering	22	198
Chemical Engineering	28	179
Petroleum Engineering	26*	171

These numbers include required courses cross-referenced with other departments, specifically an industrial and systems engineering course required for mechanical engineering majors and a geology course required of all petroleum engineering students. Because Qatar does not have faculty members from these particular departments, at TAMUQ these courses are taught by qualified faculty members in mechanical and petroleum engineering, respectively.