

Draft and Notes for IRC CCCC Workshop

Tyler Carter (U of Virginia) & Tong Zhang (Duke Kunshan University) ...on behalf of the DKU JVU WPA research group which also includes Yachao Sun, Kris Hiller, and Wendy Li who are not here for the workshop.

1. Institutional Description

This work began at Duke Kunshan University, a Sino-foreign Joint Venture University (JVU) located in Kunshan China. Sino-foreign JVU's (defined more elaborately in the draft) are universities in China where foreign partner universities merge with Chinese universities to form new degree granting universities. At the time we started this project, there were 8 independent degree granting JVUs in China. These uniquely multilingual and transcultural environments got us wondering about how writing and language was being taught at other, seemingly similar institutions. The draft below is only focused on our survey results. We are in the process of analyzing our interview results which we plan to fold into a second, full length paper (the one below is only 5000 words).

2. Key theorists

Our research group comes from a variety of backgrounds including L2 writing, Composition, TESOL, and education. Moreover, there is not a lot of research on JVUs because these kinds of institutions are relatively new. That said, we will do our best to list some of the key theorists that have guided our thinking on this project:

- a) **Jill Gladstein & Dara Regaignon**'s book length study *Writing Program Administration at Small Liberal Arts Colleges* served as a model of sorts for our initial survey. None of us are well versed in WPA theory, **Shirley Rose, Christine Tardy**, and other folks writing about multilingual administrative contexts have also been useful in this vein. Admittedly we don't have a single agreed upon analytical frame, but as far as methods, survey and interviews are the main research methods we've used. We are also aware of a number of edited collections such as *Transnational Writing Program Administration* and *The Internationalization of US Writing Programs*.
- b) Work in CLA and translingual approaches to writing instruction and theory has also informed our approach. There isn't one particular theorist that stands out though one of the group members, **Yachao Sun**, has written extensively on translingual approaches, which informs some of our thinking on English Medium Institutions (EMI) and ethical issues in relation to language and writing instruction. **Ou & Gu** is a paper that we pull from multiple times in the draft below.
- c) Historical work in US as well as UK composition contexts since these are the contexts from which many of the foreign partnering institutions come from. Similar to the previous bullet point, there are a range of these folks that we've drawn from but some of the names include **Sharon Crowley, Paul Kei Matsuda, and Tony Silva**. Additionally, I (Tyler Carter) have synthesized some of this historical work that puts language and writing education history into transdisciplinary conversation via a paper

called “Apples and Oranges: Toward a Comparative Rhetoric of Writing Instruction and Research in the United States” published in *College English* in 2023.

- d) Some of the work that does exist on these institutions also comes out of work in transnational higher education, so as, **Peter De Costa** is a scholar whose work on language policy, EMI institutions, and ideology in language learning has been important for some member of the research group.
- e) Finally, we also draw from the websites and stated goals of these institutions themselves as well as from the popular literature as these institutions are greatly influenced by global politics and other trends (e.g. AI) which are constantly changing.

So, these are some of our theorists, though really this is more like a sketch of the literature we’ve been reading to ground this project. The draft below is currently under review and one of the reviewer’s questions is to why this work is relevant, including relevant to who. Because JVUs are seemingly such unique institutions we are constantly thinking about how this work can intersect with larger bodies of scholarship since there is not a large body of scholarship to which this work obviously connects outside of transnational education, in which writing studies is not so much of a thing.

3. Glossary

Sino-foreign Joint Venture University, or Sino-foreign JVU: Sino-foreign JVUs are independent, degree-granting institutions co-established by Chinese and partner universities from outside mainland China that deliver full degree programs and deliberately blend international and local academic cultures. Note that these JVUs are different from the many cooperative programs that are formed between universities across international lines (e.g. a small engineering program from a US university that is housed in a large Chinese university). This difference centers on the degree granting ability of these JVUs.

English Medium Institution, or EMI: An institution located in a non-primarily English speaking country where English is the primary language of instruction.

**

The Development of Writing Programs in Sino-Foreign Joint-Venture Universities in

China: Opportunities, Challenges, and Pathways Forward

Abstract

This study examines how undergraduate writing is organized and taught in English-Medium-Instruction (EMI) Sino-foreign joint-venture universities (JVUs) in China, a growing form of

transnational higher education. Drawing on a survey of writing-program leaders at eight EMI JVUs, we map the “sites of writing” that collectively function as writing programs, including required EAP and composition courses, discipline-based writing, and co-curricular supports such as writing centers. Findings show that JVUs negotiate imported Anglophone writing models, Chinese institutional norms, and students’ multilingual repertoires, generating both opportunities and challenges. On the one hand, diverse faculty profiles and administrative structures enable hybrid, interdisciplinary, and translingual pedagogies. On the other hand, strong EMI policies, standardized curricula, limited longitudinal assessment, and uneven faculty development can reinforce monolingual ideologies and fragment responsibility for writing. We conclude by outlining contextually responsive directions—centered on critical language awareness, coordinated faculty development, adaptive curricula, and longitudinal research—for more equitable TNHE writing education.

Keywords: writing program, JU, opportunity, challenge, pathway

Introduction

The expansion of transnational higher education (TNHE) is one of the noticeable developments in global academia over the past few decades (Duff, 2015). These collaborations, established through partnerships between universities, governments, and private entities across different countries/regions, reflect broader trends in globalization and the pursuit of international

reputations (Author 5 et al., 2021). They provide unique environments where English Medium Instruction (EMI) coexists with local languages, and where multiple academic cultures, policies, and pedagogical models converge. As China ascends to a more prominent role in international education, Sino-foreign joint-venture universities (JVUs)—a form of TNHE—have emerged as a new phenomenon. Sino-foreign JVUs, in this study, are viewed as independent, degree-granting institutions co-established by Chinese and partner universities from outside mainland China that deliver full degree programs and deliberately blend international and local academic cultures. These JVUs aim to develop “glocalized” programs that provide globally informed, yet locally adapted, learning experiences tailored to both Chinese and international students.

In this context, the teaching and learning practices in writing (especially L2 writing in this EMI context) long associated with U.S. academic norms (Author 3, 2023) are an awkward fit. Writing programs, traditionally developed and institutionalized in the United States, have become models for building or transforming writing and literacy instruction worldwide. At Sino-foreign JVUs, L2 writing instruction is not confined to stand-alone writing programs. Instead, L2 writing instruction is often dispersed across “sites of writing” (Gladstein & Regaignon, 2012), including language support centers, English for academic purposes (EAP) courses, discipline-specific writing initiatives, and various forms of academic writing support. The establishment and evolution of writing programs or “sites of writing” at these JVUs present unique opportunities, challenges, and open pathways for the development of multilingual and translingual writing pedagogy. This study, one of the first overviews of such writing programs in China’s Sino-foreign JVUs, introduces their key sites of writing and examines the administrative and pedagogical complexities they face. We argue that these dynamics demand context-sensitive

L2 writing instruction, such as locally responsive curricula, aligned assessments, and translingual and interdisciplinary support, to meet the evolving needs of multilingual students.

Transnational Higher Education as a Global Trend

Understanding L2 writing education in Sino-foreign JVUs requires an understanding of developments in TNHE. The globalization of higher education has far-reaching implications, among which the establishment of transnational institutions is one of the most visible. TNHE involves the creation and delivery of academic programs, curricula, and degrees across national borders. Fueled by the worldwide expansion of English as a lingua franca in academia, TNHE contexts challenge conventional notions of higher education as a nationally bounded system (Author 5 et al., 2022). They encourage new types of institutional arrangements that transcend traditional political and linguistic borders, often forging complex networks of students, faculty, resources, and knowledge.

Key drivers behind this movement include a combination of state and institutional aspirations: governments seek to enhance global competitiveness and international reputations for their national education systems, while universities endeavor to diversify revenue streams, broaden their global brand presence, and improve their standing in international rankings (Author 1, 2023). At the heart of these motivations lies the English language, which serves as the medium of instruction in contexts where English is not the majority's first language. This EMI policy is inextricably tied to TNHE's rationale, as English often functions as a lingua franca connecting students and faculty from diverse linguistic backgrounds (Author 5 et al., 2022).

Yet, these transformations occur with complexity and challenges. Scholars have raised concerns about the hegemonic status of English and the risk of reinforcing monolingual ideologies, marginalizing local knowledge and languages, and commodifying language

education. Issues of diversity, inclusion, equity, and access have also surfaced, challenging institutions to pursue more critically informed and ethically responsible forms of transnational education (see Author 1 (2023) for a brief review of these studies). The case of China provides a particularly compelling lens through which to examine the interplay of national policy, linguistic ideologies, and institutional development. Within this broader TNHE landscape, L2 writing education in Sino-foreign JVUs is a site of negotiation of these global-local tensions. As JVUs import English writing norms and pedagogies while operating within Chinese sociolinguistic and policy frameworks, they become key arenas in which the promises and contradictions of TNHE are enacted, contested, and potentially reimagined.

Sino-Foreign Joint-Venture Universities

China's engagement with TNHE emerged as the country sought to strengthen its education and raise its international profile in tandem with its political and economic development (MOE, 2003). Since the late 1990s, Sino-foreign cooperative programs (see Author 1 (2023) for more information) and the more recent Sino-foreign JVUs have proliferated. At the time of this study in 2023, there were eight such JVUs in China operating with EMI. What distinguishes Sino-foreign JVUs from earlier forms of cooperation, such as joint-degree or international programs hosted within existing Chinese universities, is their status as independent, degree-granting universities with their own campuses. Instead of importing foreign curricula or faculty, JVUs are co-established by Chinese and “foreign” universities, including universities from Hong Kong. They offer entire degree programs and aim to blend pedagogical traditions, often reflecting a hybrid academic culture that attempts to combine elements of the international university and the local partner institution.

Despite the growth in the number and scale of these JVUs, scholarly inquiries focusing on their language and literacy practices remain limited (McKinley et al., 2021). Existing studies have examined these institutions' historical development (Huang, 2016), the challenges and opportunities they present (Han, 2017), and some of their pedagogical strategies (Author 2, 2021). Recent research has begun to scrutinize the power relations between English and Chinese and the imposition of "native-speaker" norms in these contexts (Ou & Gu, 2021). These studies, although limited, reveal an emerging phenomenon that monolingual ideologies often underpin the writing and language instruction at JVUs, potentially reproducing global hierarchies of language and knowledge systems.

Building on these insights, the EMI environment in JVUs presents sociolinguistic challenges. Although one rationale behind EMI is to enhance students' English proficiency and global competitiveness, relying exclusively on English can marginalize students whose linguistic and cultural capital is rooted in Chinese or other non-English languages. This dynamic often creates asymmetric power relations in the classroom, placing "non-native" English speakers in a less privileged position (Ou & Gu, 2021). Moreover, native-speakerism, or the ideological privileging of "native" English speakers as ideal language models, persists in these environments (Author 1, 2023). Such biases can discourage students from drawing on their full linguistic repertoires, limit the development of more inclusive pedagogies, and restrict knowledge production to monolingual frameworks that valorize "standard" English varieties.

Another challenge is the necessity to meet both Chinese and international partners' standards, while simultaneously adhering to China's Ministry of Education (MOE) regulations. Different educational philosophies, policies, and accreditation requirements collide, compelling administrators and faculty to navigate multiple, and sometimes conflicting, frameworks (Tardy et

al., 2024). For example, international faculty who teach in JVUs may be contracted by an international partner university but must also comply with local regulations, policies, and cultures that may differ from their contracted university contexts.

The next challenge relates to local and foreign academic conventions, particularly in writing pedagogy. Western academic writing standards, shaped by U.S. rhetorical traditions, may not fully align with Chinese students' educational backgrounds, cognitive styles, or linguistic repertoires. Furthermore, JVUs host multiple cultures of teaching and learning that extend beyond the binary of "Chinese" and "Western." Faculty and students at JVUs come from various countries, each with distinct cultural and pedagogical traditions. The confluence of these factors complicates the development of writing programs in these contexts.

Writing Programs: U.S. Origins, Global Impacts

Writing programs have a long history in the Anglophone world, especially in the United States. Over the past century, composition and rhetoric and L2 writing have established themselves as key fields, resulting in mature writing programs with distinct philosophies, curricular structures, and institutional support systems (Author 3, 2023). These programs commonly emphasize critical thinking, argumentative writing, and a process-oriented approach to composition. With globalization, the influence of U.S.-based writing programs has spread, informing L2 writing instruction and EAP curricula worldwide. However, such an importation of practice raises questions about the compatibility of Western-style writing programs with local linguistic, cultural, and institutional conditions. Although English has become the lingua franca of academia, writing programs face ongoing debates over what defines "good" academic writing. Writing programs worldwide have to recognize students' diverse linguistic and discursive backgrounds, moving beyond deficit views to embrace pedagogies that validate them as

knowledge creators and enrich academic writing through their multilingual and multicultural resources (Fraiberg et al., 2017).

Studies focusing on L2 writing instruction in Sino-foreign JVUs have begun to explore the interplay between writing pedagogy and local contexts. Author 2 (2021) and Author 1 (2023) suggest that developing effective writing education in JVUs involves not only imparting skills and strategies but also raising critical language awareness (CLA). This approach encourages students to recognize the sociopolitical dimensions of language use, question monolingual ideologies, and understand the historical power relations inherent in EMI policy contexts. By promoting CLA, writing programs can empower students to navigate transnational academic spaces more confidently, assert their linguistic identities, and contribute to more equitable knowledge production. Despite research on EMI, native-speakerism, and translingual approaches, as far as we know, no studies have examined how writing programs are developed and organized in these EMI JU settings. This gap is significant because decisions about the location of “sites of writing,” instructor profiles, curriculum integration, and administrative structures directly shape students’ opportunities to develop L2 writing, their access to multilingual resources, and their broader academic trajectories. By mapping these dimensions, this study documents the current configurations, opportunities, and challenges of L2 writing education in these institutions and identifies ways to design more contextually responsive, multilingual, and equitable writing curricula. Therefore, our study was guided by the following questions:

1. How is writing taught at these JVUs?
2. What are some opportunities that JVUs have for pedagogical innovation?
3. What are some challenges that JVUs face?

The Study

This study investigated writing program development in sites of writing at eight EMI JVUs in China. Because not all JVUs have stand-alone writing programs, we use “sites of writing” (Gladstein & Regaignon, 2012) to refer to the various contexts where writing instruction and support occur, such as formal writing courses, discipline-specific writing initiatives, and writing centers. In this study, we viewed these sites of writing collectively as writing programs to better understand how writing programs are developed within these JVUs. By examining these sites comparatively, this research aims to capture the overall shape and scope of writing program structures within these rapidly evolving universities and to document how diverse academic, disciplinary, and institutional cultures influence writing program development. After reviewing publicly available online resources (e.g., MOE of China) in 2023, we identified nine Sino-foreign JVUs in China. Of these, eight enacted EMI and were selected as the focus of this study, while one JU using Russian as the primary language of instruction was excluded due to our focus on EMI institutions. To achieve a more comprehensive understanding of writing instruction and support at these JVUs, we identified program heads or directors responsible for writing programs or writing instruction through institutional websites and our professional contacts. We then emailed them an introduction to the research team, project objectives, and a link to an online Qualtrics survey, and all eight directors completed the survey. As Table 1 shows, some JVUs are similar in undergraduate enrollment, founding period, and partner type (American, European, or Hong Kong), whereas others differ along these dimensions. However, all are broad-based institutions offering a wide range of majors. To address concerns regarding institutional anonymity, we coded the universities as JU 1–8. The data gathered consisted of university profiles based on both online information and survey responses. In response to some

participants' concerns, we deliberately use less explicit details about their founding years, partner universities, programs, departments, divisions, and schools to prevent easy identification¹. This research was approved by the researchers' university IRB.

Table 1. An overview of the eight Sino-foreign JVUs

JVU Code	Founding Period	Undergraduate Student Population Range	Institutional Partner Type	Data collected
JVU-1	Early 2010s	1,000-2,000	An American institution	University profile & Survey
JVU-2	Early 2010s	1,000-2,000	An American institution	University profile & Survey
JVU-3	Mid-2010s	1,000-2,000	A European institution	University profile & Survey
JVU-4	Early 2000s	5,000-10,000	A Hong Kong institution	University profile & Survey
JVU-5	Early 2000s	5,000-10,000	A European institution	University profile & Survey
JVU-6	Mid-2010s	5,000-10,000	An American institution	University profile & Survey
JVU-7	Mid-2010s	5,000-10,000	A Hong Kong institution	University profile & Survey
JVU-8	Mid-2000s	>20,000	A European institution	University profile & Survey

The survey instrument was structured into nine sections—Participant Information, Student Demographics & Admissions, Institutional Information, Writing Program Administration, Faculty, Curriculum, Assessment, Co-curricular Support, and Policy—each containing between 5 and 31 questions aligned with our research objectives (see the survey instrument in supplementary materials). The primary aim of this survey was to gain a context-sensitive understanding of writing program development at the identified JVUs, rather than to

¹ In presenting results, we use generic descriptors (e.g., year ranges for founding dates and broad categories for partner institutions, programs, departments, divisions, and schools) to minimize the risk of re-identification.

capture respondents' subjective opinions. Accordingly, questions focused on tangible details, such as the presence of standardized curricula or syllabi for required writing courses, and whether writing curricula were locally developed, imported, or adapted from partner universities. Insights gleaned from the preliminary university profiles informed the survey's design and helped ensure its relevance to the distinctive conditions of the Sino-foreign JVUs. By analyzing these survey responses, we gained a more nuanced and comprehensive perspective on how writing instruction is currently shaped and administered. Ultimately, this approach provided a foundation for understanding existing practices and for guiding future research agendas aimed at advancing writing pedagogy and support within these transnational educational settings.

Writing Program Development in Sino-Foreign JVUs

How is writing taught at these JVUs?

Across the eight EMI JVUs, writing is taught through multiple “sites of writing” that combine required language/writing courses, discipline-based instruction, and co-curricular support. Most institutions mandate EAP and/or first-year composition courses that foreground academic literacy, critical thinking, and rhetorical awareness within liberal arts or general education frameworks and integrate writing instruction or support into research-led, final-year projects and thesis supervision (JVUs 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8). One embeds writing more heavily in technical or engineering contexts (JRU 3). All JVUs supplement required courses with writing centers, workshops, or other forms of co-curricular support, so that students encounter writing instruction both inside and outside the classroom rather than through a single, standalone course.

Writing is delivered by instructors with diverse linguistic and disciplinary backgrounds, but equally important are the programs and units that shape their work. Some JVUs recruit faculty primarily through their international networks and explicitly model U.S.- or UK-style

composition and EAP curricula (JVUs 1, 3, 6), while others assemble mixed teams of Chinese and international instructors housed in language, culture, or humanities divisions that blend composition, applied linguistics, and English language education traditions (JVUs 2, 4, 5, 7, 8). These programmatic configurations and hiring practices mean that the curriculum is not purely “imported” or purely local; instead, writing instruction emerges from ongoing negotiation among partner-university conventions, Chinese institutional norms, and the multilingual realities of students and teachers.

Administrative structures further shape how writing is taught by determining who designs curricula, coordinates instruction, and supports faculty. Most JVUs maintain dedicated writing programs or English units with clear leadership (area heads, senior directors, executive directors, or deans) responsible for curriculum development, instructor support, and assessment, often aligned with liberal arts, WAC/WID, or research-led institutional missions (JVUs 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8). One situates writing more narrowly within technical communication programs tied to specific disciplinary priorities (JU 3). These configurations point to a complex, transnational ecology of writing instruction: rather than following a single template, JVUs blend partner-university models and Chinese institutional conventions to create context-sensitive, multilingual writing programs that both reproduce and selectively rework global norms of academic literacy.

What are some opportunities that JVUs have for pedagogical innovation?

One key opportunity arising from this study lies in the potential for JVUs to serve as contexts of pedagogical innovation. As our findings show, the presence of diverse teaching faculty, ranging from international experts in applied linguistics () to local academics who specialize in discipline-specific literacies (), enables JVUs to integrate multiple epistemic traditions. This diversity in faculty creates fertile ground for hybrid pedagogies that transcend

simplistic binaries between “Western” and “Eastern” models of education. JVUs can develop writing instruction that draws on a mosaic of rhetorical conventions, enabling students to write confidently across disciplines, languages, and cultures. (we need to revise this paragraph and insert evidence from the surveys into it to support the findings)

Similarly, the various approaches to embedding writing across the curriculum suggest that JVUs are well-positioned to promote deeper engagement with academic literacy as a mode of inquiry rather than a mere skill set. The coexistence of stand-alone writing programs (JVUs 1 ...), EAP sequences (JVUs...), and writing-intensive disciplinary courses (JVU 3) reflects a growing recognition that writing development is not the exclusive domain of language specialists. Writing becomes integral to students’ intellectual growth, shaping their identities as knowledge producers. (we need to revise this paragraph and insert evidence from the surveys into it to support the findings)

The administrative structures at JVUs further reveal institutional capacities to support such innovation. The existence of writing centers (JVUs ...), language divisions (JVUs ...), and associated administrative roles (JVUs ...) underscores a recognition at the governance level that writing instruction is critical to academic success. With strategic leadership, these administrative units can evolve into hubs that nurture faculty development, support curriculum design, and catalyze cross-institutional exchange of best practices. (we need to revise this paragraph and insert evidence from the surveys into it to support the findings)

What are some challenges that JVUs face?

However, the opportunities come hand-in-hand with significant challenges. Foremost among them is the tension between the dominance of English as an academic lingua franca and the risk of marginalizing local linguistic traditions and epistemologies. Our findings indicate that

English remains the primary medium of instruction and a gatekeeper to academic success, albeit with some flexibility. For example, all eight JVUs adopt EMI as the overarching language policy for writing instruction. At some institutions, this policy is interpreted as a strict prohibition on the use of non-English language resources (e.g., Chinese, Korean, French, Spanish) in writing instruction (JVUs 4, 5, 8); others permit non-English resources only under certain conditions, such as use outside the classroom or in accordance with China's MOE requirements (JVUs 1, 3, 6, 7), and one institution (JU 2) applies EMI more flexibly, with practices varying from course to course. For EMI-related instructional training, some JVUs provide support through workshops, seminars, and materials (JVUs 2, 5, 6, 8), while others offer no formal training, assuming that globally recruited faculty do not require it (JVUs 1, 3, 4, 7). These findings show that although there is some flexibility, EMI is firmly implemented, leaving limited opportunities for translingual practices, especially in classroom teaching. This positionality of English may inadvertently reinforce monolingual ideologies and sideline students' home languages, overlooking the rich intellectual, emotional, and cultural capital they represent. The priority of recruiting instructors from Anglophone backgrounds in some JVUs (e.g., JVUs 3, 6), while valuable for certain pedagogical aims, can sometimes perpetuate native-speakerist assumptions and limit the recognition of multilingual resources.

Another challenge lies in the tension between standardization and flexibility in curriculum design and assessment. Most JVUs report having standardized curricula or syllabi for required writing courses (JVUs 2, 4, 5, 6, 7), JU 3 uses curricula directly from the international partner university, and JVUs 1 and 8 rely on and adapt partner-derived curricula to meet local needs. In these cases, the emphasis on either standardization or fidelity to partner models can constrain the flexibility needed to design writing instruction in response to shifting global

debates and evolving local conditions in L2 writing education. A similar pattern appears in assessment: most JVUs assess student writing primarily within required writing courses and, in some cases, additional content courses and/or discrete proficiency measures (JVUs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8), whereas only two JVUs report tracking students' writing development across students' four-year undergraduate studies (JVUs 6, 7). Without robust, longitudinal assessment infrastructures, it is difficult for JVUs to monitor how students' writing actually develops over time and to use that evidence to iteratively redesign curricula, supports, and policies in more responsive ways.

A further challenge concerns faculty development and the extent to which it supports inter/transdisciplinary collaboration around writing (Authors, 2024). While several JVUs do provide professional development opportunities—such as mentoring and program-level teaching talks (JVU-1), discretionary funding for conferences, research projects, and workshops (JVU-2), structured teaching-track career pathways and continuous appointment (JVU-4), curriculum and writing-support leadership roles (JVU-5), and institutional workshops, round tables, symposia, and in-house development with conference support (JVUs 6, 8)—these initiatives are largely located within individual programs or language units rather than coordinated across disciplines. As a result, chances for faculty in STEM, social sciences, and humanities to co-design writing tasks, share assessment practices, or collectively explore EMI and translingual pedagogies remain limited. Faculty development is also uneven: one JBU described opportunities for writing-related professional development as “not much” (JVU-3), and another did not report any provision at all (JVU-7), suggesting the absence of a clear strategy. This program-specific and sometimes minimal support constrains the emergence of shared, campus-wide understandings of writing as a transdisciplinary responsibility and makes it difficult to sustain robust WAC initiatives.

Pathways Forward: Toward Contextually Responsive Writing Education

Against the backdrop of globalizing higher education systems, the surveyed JVUs demonstrate a remarkable range of approaches to incorporating writing, often considered a Western-style pedagogical domain, into their curricular and administrative structures. While this heterogeneity reflects the adaptability and resilience of these JVUs, it also underscores the need for more contextually sensitive and theoretically informed frameworks (e.g., CLA and translingual ones). In this section, we discuss the pathways forward that may help JVUs navigate the next stage of writing program development in TNHE contexts. These pathways offer a basic foundation for educators, administrators, and policymakers seeking to strengthen writing instruction at JVUs and similar transnational contexts.

1. Promoting Critical Language Awareness:

Due to the relatively strict implementation of EMI policy in most Sino-foreign JVUs, it is crucial for JVUs to cultivate CLA to help students, faculty, and administrators recognize the socio-political dimensions of language use and the value of multilingual and multicultural resources for writing education. By incorporating translingual pedagogies (Author 1 et al., 2024) and encouraging reflection on language ideologies, instructors can help students navigate global academic spaces without becoming complicit in monolingual norms. This might involve writing tasks that co-construct a rubric between instructors and students (Author 4 et al., 2024), invite students to draw on their multilingual and multicultural resources (Author 2, 2021), and reflect on and critique dominant rhetorical conventions.

2. Faculty Development and Inter/Transdisciplinary Collaboration:

Long-term, sustainable improvement in writing instruction requires professional development opportunities that bring writing instructors, language specialists, and disciplinary faculty together. Workshops, seminars, and communities of practice can foster dialogue and mutual learning. Such collaborations may encourage disciplinary faculty to incorporate writing tasks that align with their fields and enable language and writing instructors to better support students as they navigate various discipline-specific genres and rhetorical strategies.

3. Adaptive Curricular Frameworks and Assessment:

JVUs should consider developing curricular frameworks that allow for more flexibility and responsiveness. Rather than relying heavily on standardized and imported models, these frameworks could use local resources, student feedback, and ongoing assessment data to refine writing courses and support services continually. Assessment practices can also shift from product-oriented testing to long-term formative assessment to promote writing as a process across academic stages, thereby encouraging experimentation, revision, and critical self-reflection among students.

4. Longitudinal and Comparative Research Agendas:

This study highlights the need for more extensive and longitudinal research. Future inquiries might compare JVUs with other TNHE contexts, examining how diverse partnership models influence writing pedagogy. Longitudinal studies could trace the evolution of writing requirements and faculty recruitment strategies over time, providing insights into the durability and adaptability of different innovations. Such research would further illuminate the relationship between local realities and global academic norms, guiding institutions toward more grounded pedagogical choices.

Our findings and proposed pathways are drawn from a pilot study based primarily on survey responses that often provided only brief, initial insights, which inevitably limits the depth, detail, and nuance of our understanding of writing development in Sino-foreign JVUs. As a result, the patterns identified here should be viewed as preliminary. Further research using richer qualitative and/or large-scale quantitative data is needed to deepen, refine, and extend this line of inquiry.

References

Duff, P. A. (2015). Transnationalism, multilingualism, and identity. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 57-80. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051400018X>

Fraigberg, S., Wang, X., & You, X. (2017). Inventing the world grant university: Chinese international students' mobilities, literacies, and identities. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Gladstein, J. M., & Regaignon, D. R. (2012). *Writing program administration at small liberal arts colleges*. Parlor Press.

Han, X. (2017). The challenges and benefits of transnational higher education: A case study of Sino-foreign cooperation university in China. In C. S. Collins (Ed.), *University-community engagement in the Asia Pacific* (pp. 41-55). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-45222-7_4

McKinley, J., Rose, H., & Zhou, S. (2021). Transnational universities and English medium instruction in China: How admissions, language support and language use differ in Chinese universities. *RELC Journal*, 52(2), 236-252.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211020032>

MOE. (2003). Regulations of the People's Republic of China on Chinese-foreign Cooperation in running schools. <https://www.crs.jsj.edu.cn/news/index/3> (Accessed 17 December 2024).

Ou, W. A., & Gu, M. M. (2021). Language socialization and identity in intercultural communication: Experience of Chinese students in a transnational university in China. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(3), 419-434.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1472207>

Tardy, C. M., Mejia Mayorga, J. F., & Palese, E. (2024). Navigating ethical challenges in L2 writing in transnational higher education. In P. I. De Costa, A. Rabie-Ahmed, & C. Cinaglia (Ed.), *Ethical issues in applied linguistics scholarship* (249–265). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/rmal.7.16tar>