

Surviving as Switzerland: WAC, SLW, and the Literacy Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity

ANALEIGH E. HORTON

In this article, I call for increased collaboration across subfields of writing across the curriculum (WAC) to strengthen language awareness. I first recall Walvoord's (1996) message to not act like Switzerland, a metaphor she uses to describe neutrality. However, I recontextualize Switzerland as an aspiration for its attention to multilingualism. To position the need for this culture shift, I overview WAC's inattention to multilingualism in the United States, introducing the term *literacy myth of linguistic homogeneity* to describe the frequent default to standardized English and its users. Then, illustrating the contemporary linguistic diversity in US higher education, I affirm the need for revised conceptions of language. I use second language writing (SLW) studies as a touchstone for recent calls for language awareness that have gone mostly unanswered. Finally, I provide logistic, structural, and rhetorical possibilities with specific strategies to begin this work at the expert, field, and institutional levels. In closing, I seek to "walk the walk" by offering this text written in my second language (L2), Spanish. Available at <https://bit.ly/horton-wac-suiza>

Reclaiming Switzerland

"WAC cannot survive as Switzerland" (Walvoord, 1996, p. 69).

Barbara Walvoord, a WAC pioneer, poignantly wrote this statement at WAC's twenty-fifth anniversary in *College English*. Her metaphorical use of Switzerland drew on the Swiss' famous neutrality. Because of WAC's lack of connectedness, Walvoord speculated that it would not have enough funding or relationships with other fields and national organizations to be durable, and therefore WAC was going to "die" (p. 70).

But what if now, a half century later, we looked at Switzerland differently?

According to *Discover Switzerland*, the Swiss government's official site on Swiss society, politics, education, and more:

Switzerland has four language regions: German, French, Italian, and Romansh. . . . Non-national languages are also gaining importance. The two most widely spoken non-national languages are English and Portuguese. *Multilingualism is an essential part of Switzerland's identity.* (Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft, 2022, para. 1, emphasis added)

Walvoord's point was well-taken at the time. WAC as a field has since become more solidified through helpful resources like this journal, the Association of Writing Across the Curriculum (AWAC), and the biannual International Writing Across the Curriculum (IWAC) conference. However, now that WAC has made so much progress toward not dying as Switzerland, it's time to adapt to the Swiss' embrace of multilingualism and survive as Switzerland.

Surviving as Switzerland (i.e., multilingua-fying the field) is a complex endeavor of promoting diversity and inclusion across WAC's multiple dimensions (Perryman-Clark, 2023). Bouza (2023), also citing Walvoord's text, approaches linguistic justice at the departmental level. However, drawing from the whole-systems approach to WAC (Cox et al., 2018), our thinking about linguistically just WAC needs to be holistic. Multi-faceted. Strategic. I write this article with the positionality of a writing program administrator who knows institutional change necessitates external research to justify our requests for funding, status, course caps, and the like. The synthesis of WAC's monolingual tradition outlined in this paper illustrates how the kinds of scholarship departments might need to make their case is limited. There has been a delegation of us working at the WAC-SLW intersection. Still, the field overall has been slower to adopt a more linguistically nuanced epistemology, instead reinforcing what I term and define below, *the literacy myth of linguistic homogeneity*, that implies an archetypal university student who is a monocultural, monolingual English speaker.

WAC theorists might reflect on WAC's history to see where multilingualism has been excluded from the conversation and be encouraged to update our funds of knowledge in the age of globalism. WAC practitioners might consider local-level opportunities to embrace more sociocultural approaches to instruction and inclusion. Guided by Walvoord's (1996) metaphor of Switzerland, this discussion invites conversations about how the ubiquity of English in US higher education might be reconciled with the now-ubiquity of globalization. The logistic, structural, and rhetorical possibilities I present can be taken up to move us as a field so we can make moves within our own contexts. In doing so, we can maintain Walvoord's collaborative intentions and evolve them to fit a 2020s linguistic landscape, surviving as Switzerland with linguistic justice as an essential part of WAC's identity.

Monolingualism as Tradition

Between Walvoord's (1996) writing at WAC's twenty-fifth anniversary and Elder's (2023) Special Issue on its fiftieth, *College Writing and Beyond* (Beaufort, 2007) and *Undergraduates in a Second Language* (Leki, 2007) arose as two important texts for examining students' longitudinal development as writers across the curriculum. The former text (Beaufort, 2007) introduces Tim, whose story concluded that because "novice writers usually get little instruction on how to study and acquire the writing practices of different discourse communities," students struggle to navigate the "writing standards [that] are largely culturally and socially specific" (p. 11). This is a particularly salient finding because Tim identified as an L1 English, white male from the United States. It begs the question that if Tim struggled to develop literacy in a sociolinguistic space that supported him, what kinds of challenges might students not matching his identity markers encounter? Leki (2007) responds by presenting international students from the People's Republic of China, Poland, and Japan: Ben, Jan, Yuko, and Yang, who regularly emoted exhaustion and powerlessness when working with instructors who "just want to keep misunderstanding" (Yang, in Leki, 2007, p. 273). Yang ultimately resolved to be "quite cautious in dealing with her instructors, managing her relationships carefully, deciding not to dispute her instructors' opinions about her, not to argue" (Leki, p. 274). Since these landmark publications of student experiences, writing experts have developed WAC methods to help smooth the kinds of bumps that Ben, Jan, Tim, Yang, and Yuko alike encountered.

However, extant literature (e.g., CCCC, 2020; Horner, 2023; Zhang-Wu, 2022) points to these programs potentially being designed more for students like Tim—who can serve as an archetype of a linguistically normative student in most US institutions—than students like Ben, Jan, Yang, and Yuko—examples of the many students who do not fit into the traditional sociolinguistic mold. If our threshold concepts of writing studies (Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2016) affirm that literacy development is impacted by our social and rhetorical representations of the world, events, ideas, and feelings, it reasons that students whose worldviews are more closely aligned with their institution's might be more likely to succeed. Moreover, as our threshold concepts also affirm that writing involves the negotiation of language differences, students whose language is more closely aligned with their institution's language are probably also more likely to succeed. To further examine this idea of an archetypal student who thrives, let's turn to two pieces of writing studies lore: the literacy myth and the myth of linguistic homogeneity.

The Literacy Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity

We will begin by defining the literacy myth and the myth of linguistic homogeneity.

- The *literacy myth* is “the belief, articulated in educational, civic, religious, and other settings, contemporary and historical, that the acquisition of literacy is a necessary precursor to and inevitably results in economic development, democratic practice, cognitive enhancement, and upward social mobility” (Graff, 2010, p. 635).
- The *myth of linguistic homogeneity* is “the tacit and widespread acceptance of the dominant image of composition students as native speakers of a privileged variety of English” (Matsuda, 2006, p. 638).

If we consider them together, these beliefs might indicate that a student who can acquire expert-level academic English will earn prosperity. In turn, literacy education that upholds this belief (often zeroed in on the benefits of literacy knowledge), will prioritize functional literacy education, or the acquisition of a particular “*saying (writing)—doing—being—valuing—believing*” (Gee, 1989, p. 6, emphasis original) combination. Functional literacy education defaults to the rule-based pedagogy that only acknowledges specific linguistic and rhetorical forms as correct. However, this paradigm neglects that these are myths and, ergo, untrue. Gee goes on to explain how there are many ways in which people say, write, do, be, value, and believe. This perspective of multiplicity aligns with the sociocultural paradigm of literacy learning that affirms that there are many more methods of making meaning than just one. However, although many literacy scholars have turned toward the social approach, countless institutions still uphold more prescriptive traditions, which are challenging enough for L1 English, US-born students who are more enculturated into the social system, and even more difficult for students with divergent sociolinguistic backgrounds (Leki, 2007). Consequently, functional literacy pedagogies pursuant of what I call *the literacy myth of linguistic homogeneity* repeatedly limit, if not harm, multilingual students’ literacy development.

Scholarship has portrayed the kinds of harm some multilingual students experience. For example, Inez, a Hispanic bilingual Spanish/English student, enjoyed writing in high school (Saidy, 2018). However, when she started college, she was placed into what she interpreted as a highly racialized, remedial writing course. She felt disconnected from other students on campus, sensing that the university had segregated her class of non-white students because it had little faith in these students’ success. Over time, she lost confidence in her abilities because she perceived the university considered her a weak writer, and she lost her excitement for writing. Similarly, in “‘We are a ghost in the class’: First Year International Students’ Experiences in the Global Contact Zone,” six multilingual students evidenced little embedded language and literacy instruction in their courses across different disciplines (Freeman & Li, 2019). Each participant commented on feeling insecure in their intercultural competence and fearful to communicate with L1 English students, thus feeling isolated

in their classes. Their expectations to form relationships and practice English went unmet, and they struggled consequently.

These studies are just two instances in the profusion of literature on multilingual writing in higher education. Overall, SLW research indicates that a) there is a significant population of multilingual writers, b) there are challenging questions about teaching multilingual students and encouraging their literacy and identity development, and c) that lacking support for multilingual writers is an ongoing issue. SLW praxis is capacious in its questions on

- How to accurately identify students and their language backgrounds (e.g., Nero, 1997; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008; Riazantseva, 2012)
- Placement (e.g., Crusan, 2011; Ferris et al., 2017; Ruecker, 2011)
- Standards of academic writing (e.g., Canagarajah, 2015; De Costa, 2020; Horner et al., 2011)
- Supporting student identity development (e.g., Cox et al., 2010; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004; Skerrett, 2013)
- Preparing and supporting students for writing beyond foundational writing courses (e.g., Pessoa & Mitchell, 2019; Zamel, 1995; Zawacki & Cox, 2014)

Across the literature are recurring issues of students not feeling comfortable with being labeled by certain terms (e.g., ESL, Generation 1.5), experiencing a sense of otherness, and encountering challenges navigating academic contexts and requirements. Adjacently, faculty struggle with supporting multilingual students: reactions range from frustration with underdeveloped language and literacy skills to self-disappointment in not knowing how to better serve multilingual writers and develop programs that support them (e.g., Fishman & McCarthy, 2001; Ives et al., 2014; Lindsey & Crusan, 2011; Patton, 2011; Zamel & Spack, 2003; Zawacki & Habib, 2014).

All of this suggests that deeply rooted challenges in supporting multilingual writers might be tied to institutional cultures that overlook the literacy myth of linguistic homogeneity. McLeod (2008) asks what North America can offer to WAC movements in other parts of the world. Donahue (2009) might answer that, as far as language goes, WAC in the United States is so far behind that we cannot even enter the global WAC conversation. Rather, we should be learning from movements like the European one that, like Switzerland, champions linguistic diversity. Hall (2009) writes that, as-is, higher education in the United States is so out of touch with modern language realities that the WAC movement requires transformation at its most foundational levels to begin including multilingual writers (and their rich cultural and linguistic knowledge). Below, I trace WAC's more monolingual epistemology.

WAC has been critiqued for not always being the most welcoming to users of non-standardized forms of English (Williamson, 1988). Arguments postulate that in WAC-based pedagogy, knowing English is not enough to be successful (Faigley, 1985). Rather, success relies on students' abilities to master prescriptive norms of academic English. Anson (1988) demonstrates the tendency in WAC towards this position, stating that "diversity within the academy—particularly of goals, methods, or characteristics—seems inimical to the perpetuation of cultural and intellectual traditions" (p. 2). Because it is well-established that a very particular brand of English is a hallmark of the US academy (Horner, 2001; Horner & Trimbur, 2002), it makes sense that if WAC fears losing certain traditions, which I will reword as normative ideologies, WAC has hesitated to welcome linguistic diversity, and, consequently, support linguistically diverse students.

WAC research has historically evaded multilingualism. For example, in their 1993 report, "Where Do We Go Next in Writing Across the Curriculum?" Jones and Comprone did not address linguistic diversity as an item on WAC's agenda. Then, when reporting on "The State of WAC/WID in 2010: Methods and Results of the U.S. Survey of International WAC/WID Mapping Project," Thaiss and Porter (2010) also sidestepped linguistic concerns. They stated that sixty-one percent of all 1,138 respondent colleges and universities reported "Standard Written English" as an emphasis of their program. However, they made no mention of how multilingual writers might fit into that ideal, even though the project was purportedly international. These reports bolster claims made around the same time that WAC was reinforcing monolingual ideas (Geller, 2011) and barring multilingual writers from success (Janopoulos, 1995).

Multilingual perspectives are similarly absent in more contemporary WAC literature. A recent example of the field not being guided towards a more linguistically diverse mindset is Thaiss' (2021) Plenary Address at the 2021 International Writing Across the Curriculum (IWAC) conference titled, "WAC Fearlessness: Sustainability and Adaptability: Part One." Thaiss has written elsewhere about multilingual writers in WAC (e.g., Ferris & Thaiss, 2011; Thaiss, 2014), but only in niche collections. At this broader IWAC scale, he failed to include multilingualism or respond to globalization as important steps toward WAC being sustainable and adaptable. His Part Two co-presenter, Rutz (2021), mentioned multilingual writers, but only to briefly recall that there was a growing concern about teaching these students at her institution in 1996. In Zawacki's (2021) interview with two Hong Kong scholars, Chen and Lai, she highlights WAC's growing curiosity about transnational approaches but joins Donahue (2009) and Hall (2009) to point out that this work is done "particularly in regions where English is an additional language and scholars often draw on

different theoretical traditions” (Zawacki, 2021, p. 63). In other words, despite the recent increase in translingual and decolonial work informed by raciolinguistics (e.g., Benda et al. 2022; Cushman, 2021; Martinez, 2022), multilingual WAC work in the United States is largely lacking. This is perhaps because, as is demonstrated in “Fifty Years of WAC: Where Have We Been? Where Are We Going?” (Palmquist et al., 2020), SLW is only cursorily mentioned as a different area of writing studies, essentially positioning multilingual praxis on the periphery of WAC’s agenda. Together, these documents indicate that many WAC models gloss over or entirely exclude multilingual writers, which is, as we will explore next, out of touch with the realities of globalization and its impact on higher education.

Multilingualism as the New Norm

Although considerations for multilingual writers were maybe less necessary in decades past, now, in the 2020s, rapid globalization is bringing users of different languages into contact more than ever before. Driven largely by technological advances and increased migration, contact between languages and cultures permeates society. The Migration Policy Institute recorded twenty-seven percent of the 2023 US population—90.8 million people—as immigrants and their US-born children (Batalova, 2024) and cites the Pew Research Center’s prediction that this percentage will rise to approximately thirty-six percent by 2065 (Esterline & Batalova, 2022). The 2020 US census reported that 122,354,219 US households (21.6%) have limited English speaking skills, which is defined as “all members 14 years and over have at least some difficulty with English” (Census Bureau, 2020). The National Center for Education Statistics (2024), the primary federal entity for collecting education-related data, does not collect information about English use at the postsecondary level. However, their report of Fall 2021 students documented 5.3 million students classified as English language learners (ELLs) in K-12 public schools, where, across the fifty states, the state percentage of public school students designated as ELL was as high as 20.2% (Texas). Although the COVID-19 pandemic slowed physical migration, international internet traffic rose by forty-eight percent between mid-2019 and mid-2020 (Altman & Bastian, 2021). Responding to the correlation between COVID-19 and globalization, Altman and Bastian (2021), researchers leading the DHL Initiative on Globalization at New York University, posit that the pandemic “has not knocked globalization down to anywhere close to what would be required for strategists to narrow their focus to their home countries or regions” (para. 17). This data suggests that the sociolinguistic landscape continues to evolve across the globe.

US universities exemplify this shift. As of December 2023, there are 530,110 active Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) recipients, with as many as 1,160,000 people in the eligible population. There are thirty countries across Africa,

Asia, Europe, Oceania, North America, and South America represented by at least 450 active DACA participants as of December 2023 (Migration Policy Institute, 2024). First- and second-generation immigrant and international students accounted for one of every three students (thirty-eight percent) enrolled in US higher education in 2022 (Higher Ed Immigration Portal, 2024). In 2021, the United States hosted seventeen percent of 6.4 million globally mobile international students worldwide, more than any other country (Institute of International Education, 2023). International students accounted for approximately 4.6% of all US undergraduates in the 2019-2020 school year and contributed \$39 billion to the US economy in the 2021-2022 school year (FWD.us, 2022). The President's Budget for Fiscal Year 2023 allocated over \$1 billion in federal funding to Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs) (The White House, 2022).¹ The lucrative opportunities available in recruiting an international student body combined with increased domestic diversity have contributed to a greater focus on international and multicultural initiatives.

Institutionalized Monolingualism

Despite recognizing the material wealth of a diverse student body, institutions can devalue the sociolinguistic wealth that multilingual students offer by depositing them into monolingually-oriented systems. In other words, students who have different residency statuses or linguistic backgrounds are often normed into a standardized model of academic English discourse or else pushed to the boundaries of the academy. Instead of receiving support for their unique needs (Lee & Alvarez, 2020), students are stringently judged by their English proficiency in admissions practices (Andrade & Hartshorn, 2019), placement (Saengkhum, 2016), and assessments (Inoue, 2014). Horner (2001) comprehensively refers to these practices as English Only policies. Inoue (2015) might argue that this perpetuation of the literacy myth of linguistic homogeneity means that students must learn to "speak white." The Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) *Statement on Globalization in Writing Studies Pedagogy and Research* (2017) describes the resulting paradox:

At the heart of educational efforts is a conflict: On one hand, colleges and universities may recognize, respect, and respond to the complexities of globalization by reimagining administration, teaching, and research. On the other hand, they may use the pretext of globalization in a limited fashion to enhance institutional reputations, identify new sources of revenue, and entrench received standards. (para. 2)

1. There are seven types of MSIs. Not all MSIs are necessarily multilingual.

In settings where students are expected to have fully developed language skills, and support services (e.g., English institutes, intensive English programs, and writing centers) are short-term or maligned, literacy growth is stunted. These kinds of ideologies limit process-based writing teaching (Adler-Kassner, 2017; Driscoll & Cui, 2021; Melzer, 2022) and constrain world Englishes (Hankerson, 2022; Kubota, 2022; Milu, 2022). In turn, institutions further an idealized language or monolingual norm (Kynard, 2018; Lippi-Green, 2012).

Commentary on writing pedagogy unveils a spectrum of opinions about how institutions should respond to globalization and its impact on the linguistic landscape. Inoue (2019) compares language standardization to murder whereas Fish (2009) critiques descriptive language teaching as being “infected with the facile egalitarianism of soft multiculturalism” (para. 13). Delpit (2001) describes how many educators lie somewhere in the middle, facing “a certain sense of powerlessness and paralysis among well-meaning literacy educators who appear to be caught in the throes of a dilemma” as they try to “teach literate discourse styles to all of their students” but “question whether they are acting as agents of oppression by insisting that students who are not already a part of the ‘mainstream’ learn that discourse” (p. 545). This question is even more relevant as globalization continues to make classrooms more linguistically and culturally diverse than ever.

Institutions and institutional writing initiatives that engender more rigid notions of academic English and its users are likely investing more in the idealized archetypal student who excels within the literacy myth of linguistic homogeneity than creating a site where all students can work towards their unique literacy goals. Moreover, their stance presumably skirts the reality of a diverse student body, including:

[M]ultilingual international visa students who come to the U.S. as short-term exchange students or to complete baccalaureate degrees or graduate degrees *and* multilingual U.S. residents—an amorphous group comprising students from linguistic enclaves in the US [sic], immigrant students who have spent part of their K-12 literacy education in U.S. secondary schools, and refugee students with interrupted literacy educations. (Zawacki & Cox, 2014, p. 2, emphasis original)

Critical awareness of these students’ presence, needs, and goals situates language in social contexts and strengthens heteroglossic language ideologies (i.e., believing in the coexistence of distinct varieties within a language) instead of privileging monolingual norms (Bakhtin, 1986; García & Torres-Guevara, 2009). As we will discuss next, a cohort of SLW researchers have begun thinking through opportunities for WAC to become more malleable to dispersing power tied up in language, race, and

nationality so as to dilute literacy ideologies that position privileged language varieties as essential for the acquisition of cultural, economic, or social capital.

Preliminary WAC-SLW Collaborations

A primary goal of WAC-SLW research is developing a system that acknowledges the literacy myth of linguistic homogeneity, transitioning institutional cultures from perceiving writers' *difference-as-deficit* to *difference-as-resource* (Canagarajah, 2002). Cox and Zawacki (2011) made the first major stride towards this paradigm shift through their landmark *Across the Disciplines* special issue, "WAC and Second Language Writing: Cross-field Research, Theory, and Program Development." Contributors analyzed how the curriculum might be better globalized by creating pathways for multilingual student success, strengthening interpersonal relationships between multilingual writers and other institutional members, and developing more integrated support for multilingual writers. These conversations continued in Zawacki and Cox's (2014) edited collection, *Second-Language Writers: Research Towards Linguistically and Culturally Inclusive Programs and Practices*, which again made history as the first book-length project to examine the SLW-WAC relationship explicitly within US contexts. Their introduction cited Leki's (1992) call for WAC to "embrace" (p. 133) multilingual writers. Horner and Hall (2018) responded to this instruction by developing another special issue of *Across the Disciplines*, "Rewriting Disciplines, Rewriting Boundaries: Transdisciplinary and Translingual Challenges for WAC/WID." Hall's (2018) introduction takes up the *trans-* prefix's etymology to show how an SLW-informed WAC program can meaningfully support multilingual students' transitions across disciplinary and linguistic boundaries. WAC-SLW research intends to help students feel less like foreigners in strange and perhaps harmful discursive spaces and more like learners developing new sociolinguistic skills in a safe environment. This work is happening in other countries (see Hall & Horner, 2023)—for example, Canada (Gentil, 2023), China (Wu, 2013), Japan (Kwon, 2023), Korea (Jordan, 2022), Lebanon (Zenger et al., 2014), and Qatar (Hodges, 2023)—and can potentially act as a model for globalizing US-based WAC research and programming.

Globalizing academic writing initiatives has been a long time coming. Donahue (2023) reminds us how Silva et al. (1997) "predicted decades back that the absence of attention to writing in other languages, in our history, could have the huge effect of leading to 'inadequate theories of composition' (p. 400) overall" (p. 43-44):

Such a theory could easily become hegemonic and exclusionary; that is, English/Western writing behaviors could be privileged as being "standard"

[...] and such a theory could be seen as monolingual, monocultural, and ethnocentric. (Silva et al., 1997, p. 402)

Donahue argues that this then-hypothesis, now-reality has set US writing praxis completely out of touch with transnational dialogue. In reply, SLW experts are seeking to offer expertise to work toward infusing writing initiatives with a more globalized perspective and set of practices (e.g., Asaba, 2022; Burns, 2022). Globalizing academic writing initiatives does not mean that all boundaries of language are ignored (Matsuda, 2006). Rather, it means that academic writing initiatives recognize how many boundaries crisscross language as users introduce new dialects, modes, and cultures into ways of making meaning. Surviving as Switzerland looks like globalized academic writing initiatives designed not just for the Tims of the academy but for all students learning to write and writing to learn.

Rewriting the Literacy Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity

I was recently in a meeting with faculty and staff across the university convened by the provost, a committee called the Student Academic Success Team. We met to solidify a mission statement—a task that we had been assigned back in August (it was now late May). As weary teammates nodded along that our draft was fine, a colleague noted how the introduction promised to promote anti-racist, equitable, and culturally relevant practices, but the goals section outlined tasks that upheld standardized, Western, white, ableist norms, mostly embodied as top-down approaches to resolving students' barriers for them, without them. A respondent started typing in the shared document “equity-minded” and “inclusive” into each of the bulleted goals. “There! Problem solved!”

However, the problem was not solved. Just because you say it's anti-racist doesn't make it so. Bouza (2023) importantly encourages departmental intervention. However, this example showcases how the majority of our institutional populations are not equipped to actually intervene, akin to WAC's skirting of language awareness. For this reason, I, along with Shapiro (2023), argue for a more critical approach to the theoretical underpinnings of WAC. In my remaining space, I consider what linguistic justice looks like at the field level, guiding research and training that disciplinarians can draw from when they have to explain that debunking the literacy myth of linguistic homogeneity is more than just “talking the talk.” Specifically, I propose possibilities at the logistic, structural, and rhetorical levels to usher in a more multilingual norm.

Logistic Change

The distance between WAC and SLW is complex, and an important facet is the lack of coalition building between fields. WAC is founded upon inter- and multidisciplinary, but, at least within writing studies and applied linguistics, collaboration has been limited. In the CCCC SLW Standing Group, of which I am now the associate chair, we noticed that likeminded groups existed in isolation from each other. In 2023, we began by working with the TESOL SLW Interest Section by inviting the leadership from each group to speak at the conference meetings of the other. Then, in 2024, we expanded outreach beyond SLW by making inroads with the CCCC Linguistics, Language, and Writing Standing Group and the Progressive Approaches to Grammar Special Interest Group.² A noted issue, though, was that attending conferences was costly and, even at the same conference, our events often conflicted in time.

A logistic strategy for bringing together these funds of knowledge, then, is for a literacy broker like AWAC to host third-party meeting-of-the-minds events. Linguistic justice is a substantial endeavor. WAC should invest in uniting linguistic justice scholars from nearby areas like BIPOC research, international student and scholar affairs, and basic writing in conversations explicitly focused on WAC. Within these sites of expertise, scholars can learn from each other. For example, the aforementioned researchers who successfully conducted WAC research abroad can explain how they developed those sites of inquiry, or those skilled at creating safe spaces for marginalized voices to speak out can share their techniques. This approach could de-silo thought leadership by diversifying and developing theories and methodologies for recalibrating WAC's approaches to language. Carving out time and space for interdisciplinary discussions of linguistic justice in WAC mirrors the Swiss approach of valuing different voices.

Structural Change

Structural change concerns the ways we revise our ontology to WAC research and development. Restructuring first looks like asking questions about where linguistic diversity already exists. Young's (2018) call for proposals for the 2019 CCCC written in his vernacular and the CCCC Position Statement, "This ain't another statement! This is a DEMAND for Black linguistic justice!" (Baker-Bell et al., 2020, emphasis original) provide textual examples. CCCC has arguably been a stronger practitioner of linguistic diversity than some SLW spaces, offering, for example, American Sign Language and closed captioning at its annual conference. It has published texts like

2. These successful collaborations are largely ascribed to the leadership of Zhaozhe Wang, Shawna Shapiro, Estela Ene, Laura Aull, and Joseph Salvatore.

the above in non-standardized Englishes—progress compared to journals like the *Journal of Second Language Writing* that publish about second languages but only if written in (fairly formal) English.

A structural strategy for multilingua-fying our disciplinary artifacts is opening opportunities for different dialects and languages and destigmatizing their usage. An obvious approach is to invite multilingualism by allowing presentations and articles in other languages. Conferences might dedicate a room for presentations given in a specific L2, for example, or allow L2 presentations and ask presenters to provide transcripts in the meeting's lingua franca so that all can participate. Journals may respond similarly by accepting non-English languages or, at least, being more welcoming to Englishes that don't fit as precisely into prescriptivist norms by adopting a set of linguistic justice review guidelines. The "Anti-Racist Scholarly Reviewing Practices: A Heuristic for Editors, Reviewers, and Authors" (2021) exemplifies such a document. Lesser-cost possibilities include naming language diversity as a participant marker in studies' methodological designs. Or, instead of exclusively soliciting WAC-SLW research for niche collections, editors can encourage routine submissions of research that forefronts multiple languages and dialects. These internal changes can begin de-centering prescriptivist English so that our field no longer defaults, even if inadvertently, to the literacy myth of linguistic homogeneity.

Rhetorical Change

Beginning with logistic and structural changes is essential to carrying out rhetorical change, by which I mean academia's general tendency towards linguistic standardization. The past five or so years have seen an uptick in discussions on diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility in academia. In US states where this emphasis hasn't been straight under attack, academia has revised texts from institutional levels (e.g., naming *diversity* in strategic plans) to classroom levels (e.g., inserting *inclusion* in program outcomes). Some of these moves are likely attempts at relevancy, but even in more sincere instances, it has become a bit of a buzzword culture. Rhetorical change seeks to temper this trend by undergirding the words with wider-spread practical knowledge so that making universities more linguistically diverse, equitable, inclusive, and accessible is not just the domain of sociolinguists, but a collective effort across disciplines. This mirrors WAC's tenet of making the teaching of writing not the sole responsibility of writing program specialists, but all kinds of instructors.

A rhetorical change for empowering faculty, staff, and administrators to be agents of linguistic justice encompasses several strategies made possible by WAC's stronger investment in language awareness. Institutional WAC specialists can continue to lend and borrow case studies to examine instances of linguistic interventions. This collective development of WAC expertise can advance our understanding of issues

at the WAC-SLW intersection, like how to make directed self-placement (DSP) protocols more effective for multilingual students (Horton, 2022). Producing this kind of scholarship enables alliance building between WAC leaders experiencing similar circumstances. Bolstering the community of practice strengthens camaraderie across WAC and produces scholarship and effective practices that WAC administrators can use to communicate with institutional stakeholders. These conversations can help administrators and instructors develop flexibility in institutional, programmatic, and pedagogic design. WAC programs might already be doing this kind of work with faculty fellows, preparing instructors with discursual and pedagogical tools for linguistic justice works towards rhetorical change. Institutions that can recalibrate language ideologies will adapt to modern student populations, back their buzzwords with meaning, and model the Swiss' joy for prosperous multilingualism.

Surviving as Switzerland

In this article, sparked by the advent of WAC's fiftieth anniversary, I have reflected on the field's relationship with SLW as a touchstone for forwarding language awareness and linguistic justice. I have taken a bold step in dissenting from one of WAC's most influential founders in the United States, Barbara Walvoord, by repurposing her metaphor to describe the role of multilingualism in the 2020s and beyond. I still esteem her intention to strengthen our collaboration. Shapiro (2023) expertly articulates that promoting critical language awareness (CLA) in WAC "can build our own agency as teachers, administrators, scholars and advocates" (p. 94). Prioritizing linguistic justice in WAC work "can equip us for sustained dialogue and collaborative action that supports powerful languaging among student writers within and across academic disciplines" (Shapiro, 2023, p. 94-95). Surviving at Switzerland requires reflecting on our onto-epistemologies and taking appropriate action.

As the next generation of WAC emerges, we can strategize our logistic, structural, and rhetorical possibilities that can be defined communally. This work includes reflections such as:

- Where does the literacy myth of linguistic homogeneity prevail, and what are the implications of its assumptions?
- What potential collaborations exist, and how can they be meaningfully formed and sustained for linguistic justice?
- How can WAC scholarship pivot toward language awareness such that it becomes energy for productive change at local levels?

Engaging with these entry points hopefully points the path to Switzerland.

To bring myself to walk the walk of increasing linguistic diversity in WAC research, I have, imperfectly, translated this article into my L2, Spanish. Available at <https://bit.ly/horton-wac-suiza>

Acknowledgments

Many thanks to Aimee Mapes, Christine Tardy, and Shawna Shapiro for their support in writing this article, along with the anonymous reviewers.

References

- Adler-Kassner, L. (2017). 2017 CCCC chair's address: Because writing is never just writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 69(2), 317–340.
- Adler-Kassner, L., & Wardle, E. (Eds.). (2016). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts of writing studies* (Classroom). Utah State University Press.
- Altman, S. A., & Bastian, C. R. (2021, March 18). The state of globalization in 2021. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2021/03/the-state-of-globalization-in-2021>
- Andrade, M. S., & Hartshorn, K. J. (2019). *International student transitions: A framework for success*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Anson, C. M. (1988). Toward a multidimensional model of writing in the academic disciplines. In D. A. Joliffe (Ed.), *Advances in writing research: Writing in academic disciplines* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–33). Ablex.
- Anti-racist scholarly reviewing practices: A heuristic for editors, reviewers, and authors.* (2021). <https://tinyurl.com/reviewheuristic>
- Asaba, M. (2022). Pursuing expertise in L2 writing instruction research. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 58, 100939. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100939>
- Baker-Bell, A., Williams-Farrier, B. J., Jackson, D., Johnson, L., Kynard, C., & McMurtry, T. (2020). *This ain't another statement! This is a DEMAND for Black linguistic justice!* Conference on College Composition and Communication. <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/demand-for-black-linguistic-justice>
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). The problem of speech genres. In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.), *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. W. McGee, Trans.) (pp. 60–102). University of Texas Press.
- Batalova, J. (2024, March 13). *Frequently requested statistics on immigrants and immigration in the United States*. Migration Policy Institute. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states?gclid=Cj0KCQjwg_iTBhDrARIsAD3Ib5gHz53GxKh0Or5zsUlkDnCQ2-kc6GhQ-OT1LosXSXMcmYC8dreNC6QaAqfNEALw_wcB
- Beaufort, A. (2007). *College writing and beyond: A new framework for university writing instruction*. Utah State University Press.

- Benda, J., Jones, C. E., Poe, M., & Stephens, A. Y. L. (2022). Confronting superdiversity again: A multidimensional approach to teaching and researching at a global university. In J. R. Daniel, K. Malcolm, & C. Rai (Eds.), *Writing across difference: Theory and intervention* (pp. 218–238). Utah State University Press.
- Bouza, E. (2023). (Re)Defining WAC to guide linguistic justice ideological changes across campuses. *The WAC Journal*, 34, 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2023.34.1.05>
- Burns, A. (2022). Emergence in teacher writing expertise: Teachers be(com)ing expert. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 58, 100938. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100938>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. University of Michigan Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2015). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. In S. Perryman-Clark, D. E. Kirkland, & A. Jackson (Eds.), *Students' right to their own language: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 279–304). National Council of Teachers of English.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2017). *CCCC statement on globalization in writing studies pedagogy and research*. <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/globalization>
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2020). *CCCC statement on second language writing and multilingual writers*. <https://cccc-ncte-org.ezproxy2.library.arizona.edu/cccc/resources/positions/secondlangwriting>
- Cox, M., Galin, J. R., & Melzer, D. (2018). *Sustainable WAC: A whole systems approach to launching and developing writing across the curriculum programs*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Cox, M., Jordan, J., Ortmeier-Hooper, C., & Schwartz, G. G. (Eds.). (2010). *Reinventing identities in second language writing*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Cox, M., & Zawacki, T. M. (2014). Introduction. In T. M. Zawacki & M. Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second-language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 15–40). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551.1.3>
- Crusan, D. (2010). *Assessment in the second language writing classroom*. University of Michigan Press.
- Crusan, D. (2011). The promise of directed self-placement for second language writers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(4), 774–780. <https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2010.272524>
- Cushman, E. (2021). Decolonial translation as methodology for learning to unlearn. In C. Donahue, K. Blewett, & C. Monrow (Eds.), *The expanding universe of writing studies: Higher education writing research* (pp. 199–213). Peter Lang.

- De Costa, P. I. (2020). Linguistic racism: Its negative effects and why we need to contest it. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(7), 833–837. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1783638>
- Delpit, L. (2001). The politics of teaching literate discourse. In E. Cushman, E. R. Kintgen, B. M. Kroll, & M. Rose (Eds.), *Literacy: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 545–554). Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Donahue, C. (2009). “Internationalization” and composition studies: Reorienting the discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2), 212–243.
- Donahue, C. (2023). “We are the ‘Other’”: The future of exchanges between writing and language studies. In J. Hall & B. Horner (Eds.), *Toward a transnational university: WAC/WID across borders of language, nation, and discipline* (pp. 35–58). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.
- Driscoll, D. L., & Cui, W. (2021). Visible and invisible transfer: A longitudinal investigation of learning to write and transfer across five years. *College Composition and Communication*, 73(2), 229–260.
- Elder, C. L. (Ed.). (2023). Special issue: Transforming WAC at 50: What, how, and for whom? *The WAC Journal*, 34. <https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/journal/vol34/vol34.pdf>
- Esterline, C., & Batalova, J. (2022, March 17). Frequently requested statistics on immigrants and immigration in the United States. *The Online Journal of the Migration Policy Institute*. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states>
- Faigley, L. (1985). Nonacademic writing: The social perspective. In L. Odell & D. Goswami (Eds.), *Writing in nonacademic settings* (pp. 231–248). Guilford.
- Ferris, D. R., Evans, K., & Kurzer, K. (2017). Placement of multilingual writers: Is there a role for student voices? *Assessing Writing*, 32, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.10.001>
- Ferris, D., & Thaiss, C. (2011). Writing at UC Davis: Addressing the needs of second language writers. *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.4.27>
- Fish, S. (2009, September 7). What should colleges teach? Part 3. *The New York Times*. <https://archive.nytimes.com/opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/09/07/what-should-colleges-teach-part-3/>
- Fishman, S. M., & McCarthy, L. (2001). An ESL writer and her discipline-based professor: Making progress even when goals don't match. *Written Communication*, 18(2), 180–228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088301018002002>
- Freeman, K., & Li, M. (2019). “We are a ghost in the class.” First year international students' experiences in the global contact zone. *Journal of International Students*, 9(1), 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v9i1.270>

- FWD.us. (2022, September 14). *International students and graduates in the United States: 5 things to know*. <https://www.fwd.us/news/international-students/#:~:text=During%20the%202019%2D2020%20school,are%20from%20China%20and%20India>
- García, O., & Torres-Guevara, R. (2009). Monoglossic ideologies and language policies in the education of U.S. Latinas/os. In J. Sánchez Muñoz, M. Machado-Casas, E. G. Murillo Jr., & C. Martínez (Eds.), *Handbook of Latinos and education: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 182–193). Taylor & Francis Group.
- Gee, J. P. (1989). Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: An introduction. *The Journal of Education*, 171(1), 5–176.
- Geller, A. E. (2011). Teaching and learning with multilingual faculty. *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.4.06>
- Gentil, G. (2023). Remapping writing instruction at the borders of modern languages, bilingual education, and translation studies: A Canadian proposal for a transnational conversation. In J. Hall & B. Horner (Eds.), *Toward a transnational university: WAC/WID across borders of language, nation, and discipline* (pp. 59–83). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.
- Graff, H. J. (2010). The literacy myth at 30. *Journal of Social History*, 43(3), 635–661.
- Hall, J. (2009). WAC/WID in the next America: Redefining professional identity in the age of the multilingual majority. *The WAC Journal*, 20(1), 33–49. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2009.20.1.03>
- Hall, J. (2014). Multilinguality is the mainstream. In B. Horner & K. Kopelson (Eds.), *Reworking English in rhetoric and composition* (pp. 31–48). Southern Illinois University Press.
- Hall, J. (2018). Introduction to the special issue: Rewriting disciplines, rewriting boundaries. *Across the Disciplines*, 15(3), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2018.15.3.08>
- Hall, J., & Horner, B. (Eds.). (2023). *Toward a transnational university: WAC/WID across borders of language, nation, and discipline*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.
- Hankerson, S. (2022). “Why can’t writing courses be taught like this fo real”: Leveraging critical language awareness to promote African American Language speakers’ writing skills. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 58, 100919. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100919>
- Higher Ed Immigration Portal. (n.d.). *Immigrant and international students in higher education*. Retrieved June 4, 2024, from <https://www.higheredimmigrationportal.org/national/national-data/#:~:text=Immigrant%2Dorigin%20students%20represent%20a,all%20students%2C%20in%20higher%20education>
- Hodges, A. (2023). Mapping transnational institutions: Connecting between WAC/WID and Qatar’s engineering industry. In J. Hall & B. Horner (Eds.), *Toward a transnational university: WAC/WID across borders of language, nation, and discipline* (pp. 167–188). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.

- Horner, B. (2001). "Students' right," English only, and re-imagining the politics of language. *College English*, 63(6), 741–758. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1350100>
- Horner, B. (2023). Introduction. The transnational translingual university: Teaching academic writing across borders and between languages. In J. Hall & B. Horner (Eds.), *Toward a transnational university: WAC/WID across borders of language, nation, and discipline* (pp. 3–10). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-B.2023.1527.1.3>
- Horner, B., & Hall, J. (Eds.). (2018). Special issue: Rewriting disciplines, rewriting boundaries: Transdisciplinary and translingual challenges for WAC/WID. *Across the Disciplines*, 15(3).
- Horner, B., NeCamp, S., & Donahue, C. (2011). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication*, 63(2), 269–300.
- Horner, B., & Trimbur, J. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 53(4), 594–630. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1512118>
- Horton, A. E. (2022). Two sisters and a heuristic for listening to multilingual, international students' directed self-placement stories. *Journal of Writing Assessment*, 15(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.5070/W4JWA.222>
- Inoue, A. B. (2014). Theorizing failure in US writing assessments. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(3), 330–352.
- Inoue, A. B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press.
- Inoue, A. B. (2019). 2019 CCCC chair's address: How do we language so people stop killing each other, or what do we do about white language supremacy? *College Composition and Communication*, 71(2), 352–369.
- Institute of International Education. (2023). *2023 Project Atlas infographic*. https://www.iie.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Project-Atlas_Infographic_2023_2.pdf
- Ives, L., Leahy, E., Leming, A., Pierce, T., & Schwartz, M. (2014). Chapter 8. "I don't know if that was the right thing to do": Cross-Disciplinary/cross-institutional faculty response to L2 writing. In T. M. Zawacki & M. Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second-language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 211–232). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551.2.08>
- Janopoulos, M. (1995). Writing across the curriculum, writing proficiency exams, and the NNS college student. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(1), 43–50. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743\(95\)90022-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(95)90022-5)
- Jones, R., & Comprone, J. J. (1993). Where do we go next in writing across the curriculum? *College Composition and Communication*, 44(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.2307/358895>

- Jordan, J. (2022). *Grounded literacies in a transnational WAC/WID ecology: A Korean-U.S. study*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/international/grounded/>
- Kubota, R. (2022). Decolonizing second language writing: Possibilities and challenges. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 58, 100946. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100946>
- Kwon, M. H. (2023). Challenges in positioning WAC/WID in international contexts: Perspectives from a Japanese engineering undergraduate program. In J. Hall & B. Horner (Eds.), *Toward a transnational university: WAC/WID across borders of language, nation, and discipline* (pp. 189–204). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado.
- Kynard, C. (2018). Stayin woke: Race-Radical literacies in the makings of a higher education. *College Composition and Communication*, 69(3), 519–529.
- Lee, E., & Alvarez, S. P. (2020). World Englishes, translanguaging, and racialization in the US college composition classroom. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 263–274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12459>
- Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers*. Boynton/Cook.
- Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lindsey, P., & Crusan, D. (2011). How faculty attitudes and expectations toward student nationality affect writing assessment. *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.4.23>
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. Routledge.
- Martinez, A. (2022). English as past and present imperialism: A translingual narrative on Chicana language and identity in the US-Mexico borderlands. In T. Do & K. Rowan (Eds.), *Racing translanguaging in composition: Toward a race-conscious translanguaging* (pp. 56–66). Utah State University Press.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English*, 68(6), 637–651. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25472180>
- McLeod, S. H. (2008). The future of WAC—plenary address, ninth international writing across the curriculum conference, May 2008 (Austin, Texas). *Across the Disciplines*, 5(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2008.5.1.03>
- Melzer, D. (2022). Responding for transfer. *Composition Forum*, 50. <https://compositionforum.com/issue/50/responding-transfer.php>
- Migration Policy Institute. (n.d.). *Deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA) data tools*. Retrieved June 4, 2024, from <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca-profiles>
- Milu, E. (2022). Hip-Hop and the decolonial possibilities of translanguaging. *College Composition and Communication*, 73(3), 376–409.

- National Center for Education Statistics. (2024). *English learners in public schools*. <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgf>
- Nero, S. J. (1997). English is my native language . . . or so I believe. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 585–593. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587842>
- Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). English may be my second language, but I’m not “ESL.” *College Composition and Communication*, 59(3), 389–419.
- Palmquist, M., Childers, P., Maimon, E., Mullin, J., Rice, R., Russell, A., & Russell, D. R. (2020). Fifty years of WAC: Where have we been? Where are we going? *Across the Disciplines*, 17(3), 5–45. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2020.17.3.01>
- Patton, M. D. (2011). Mapping the gaps in services for L2 writers. *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.4.26>
- Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Channel View Publications.
- Perryman-Clark, S. M. (2023). *The new work of writing across the curriculum: Diversity and inclusion, collaborative partnerships, and faculty development*. Utah State University Press.
- Pessoa, S., & Mitchell, T. D. (2019). Preparing students to write in the disciplines. In N. A. Caplan & A. M. Johns (Eds.), *Changing practices for the L2 writing classroom: Moving beyond the five-paragraph essay* (pp. 150–177). University of Michigan Press.
- Riazantseva, A. (2012). “I ain’t changing anything”: A case-study of successful generation 1.5 immigrant college students’ writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(3), 184–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.04.007>
- Ruecker, T. (2011). Improving the placement of L2 writers: The students’ perspective. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 35(1), 91–117.
- Rutz, C. (2021). Fearlessness, sustainability, and adaptability via WAC in a small school. *The WAC Journal*, 32(1), 16–22. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2022.32.1.03>
- Saenkhum, T. (2016). *Decisions, agency, and advising: Key issues in the placement of multilingual writers into first-year composition courses*. Utah State University Press.
- Saidy, C. (2018). Inez in transition: Using case study to explore the experiences of under-represented students in first-year composition. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 41(2), 17–34.
- Schweizerische eidgenossenschaft. (2020, May 11). *Language*. Retrieved June 18, 2022, from <https://www.eda.admin.ch/aboutswitzerland/en/home/gesellschaft/sprachen.html>
- Shapiro, S. (2023). Languageing across the curriculum: Why WAC needs CLA (and vice versa). *The WAC Journal*, 34, 83–100. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2023.34.1.06>
- Silva, T., Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). Broadening the perspective of mainstream composition studies: Some thoughts from the disciplinary margins. *Written Communication*, 14(3), 398–429.
- Skerrett, A. (2013). Building multiliterate and multilingual writing practices and identities. *English Education*, 45(4), 322–360.

- Thaiss, C. (2014). Afterword: Writing globally, right here, right now. In T. M. Zawacki & M. Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second-language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 465–476). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551.3.2>
- Thaiss, C. (2021). WAC fearlessness, sustainability, and adaptability: Part one. *The WAC Journal*, 32(1), 8–15. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2022.32.1.02>
- Thaiss, C., & Porter, T. (2010). The state of WAC/WID in 2010: Methods and results of the U.S. survey of the international WAC/WID mapping project. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(3), 534–570.
- United States Census Bureau. (2020). *Limited English speaking households* (S1602) [Table]. <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=language%20spoken%20at%20home&tid=ACSST5Y2020.S1602>
- Walvoord, B. E. (1996). The future of WAC. *College English*, 58(1), 58–79.
- The White House. (2022, March 30). *President Biden's FY 2023 budget advances equity*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/briefing-room/2022/03/30/president-bidens-fy-2023-budget-advances-equity/>
- Williamson, M. M. (1988). A model for investigating the functions of written language in different disciplines. In D. A. Joliffe (Ed.), *Advances in writing research: Writing in academic disciplines* (Vol. 2, pp. 89–132). Ablex.
- Wu, D. (2013). *Introducing writing across the curriculum into China: Feasibility and adaptation*. Springer.
- Young, V. A. (2018). *Call for program proposals*. Conference on College Composition and Communication. <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/conv/call-2019>
- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46(4), 506–521.
- Zamel, V., & Spack, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Crossing the curriculum*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Zawacki, T. Myers. (2021). Conversations in process: Two dynamic program builders talk about adapting WAC for trilingual Hong Kong. *The WAC Journal*, 32(1), 63–71. <https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2022.32.1.06>
- Zawacki, T. M., & Cox, M. (2011). Introduction to WAC and second language writing. *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.4.19>
- Zawacki, T. M., & Cox, M. (Eds.). (2014). *WAC and second-language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices*. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551>
- Zawacki, T. M., & Habib, A. S. (2014). Chapter 7. Negotiating “errors” in L2 writing: Faculty dispositions and language difference. In T. M. Zawacki & M. Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second-language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 183–210). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551.2.07>

- Zenger, A., Mullin, J., & Haviland, C. P. (2014). Chapter 17. Reconstructing teacher roles through a transnational lens: Learning with/in the American University of Beirut. In T. M. Zawacki & M. 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>
- Zhang-Wu, Q. (2022). Rethinking translanguaging in college composition classrooms: A digital ethnographic study of multilingual students' written communication across contexts. *Written Communication*, 40(1), 145–174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883221127208>