Global Business Communication: *Kairos* and Discipline-Crossing along the Path toward Globally Responsive Education

Gail Shuck

Boise State University

The Power of a Network in Creating Institutional Change

As writing pedagogy and scholarship continue to evolve in response to global mobility and its educational, sociopolitical, and linguistic impacts, it behooves us as teachers, scholars, and program leaders to forge and sustain partnerships with faculty and staff in units across college campuses, as well as with different constituencies in local communities. Tarez Samra Graban (2018), Michelle Cox (2014), and other writing program leaders have argued that it is critical to build relationships with institutional and departmental agents to transform an institutional culture. Those relationships can lead to sustainable, collaborative curricular initiatives and programmatic changes (Cox et al., 2018).

Identifying allies across an institution in the work of linguistically and culturally inclusive pedagogies is an initial step. A bigger challenge is to support faculty from outside composition studies in wrestling with ideological differences surrounding language and writing. Such differences are brought into sharp focus by Emily Simnitt and Thomas Tasker's (2022) study of transdisciplinary conversations about argument and evidence and Joyce Meier, Xiqiao Wang, and Julia Kiernan's study (this volume) of a faculty learning community called "Enriching the Faculty-International Student Experience." Both studies offer clear recommendations for those who lead professional development initiatives to counter deficit models of language difference and to center multilingual students' linguistic and cultural expertise. Similarly, Lisa Arnold's (2016) study of her seminar at American University of Beirut (AUB) on writing in different fields allowed participants in the multilingual, multicultural context of Lebanon to come to value the full, collective linguistic repertoires of their classrooms, including instructors' and students' daily experiences with negotiating language difference.

The present chapter describes the importance of building a network of such partnerships for creating institutional change while understanding the role that institutional structures and dominant ideologies (of educational goals, linguistic diversity, etc.) play in either hindering or facilitating sustainable change. I also argue for the important role of *kairos* in this process, a door of opportunity that

any of us can step through or let close without action. How we build the kinds of relationships that can have transformative results can be kairotic or strategically planned or a combination of both. Jay Jordan (2021), exploring the ways that the field of rhetoric has shaped scholarship in second-language writing and translingual composition, suggests that kairos can be productively deployed as a strategy in language contact situations. He characterizes kairos as "[suspended] between the goal of timely rhetorical mastery on one hand and sensitivity, if not susceptibility, to rhetoric's immediacy, spontaneity, and potentiality, on the other" (2021, p. 26). It is not happenstance that rhetors—in this case, colleagues in different disciplines—become attuned to a kairotic moment. Disciplinary expertise and knowledge of institutional structures also inform rhetors of what and where those Aristotelian "available means" are. The development of the Global Business Communication partnership described in this chapter was the result of several individuals' collective, strategic decision to identify avenues for collaboration, and it was augmented considerably by our attunement to kairos, in particular the "emerging exigencies of diversity" (Kells, 2012, p. 3). The partners were able to pinpoint student and curricular needs, recognize responses to those needs, highlight the ethical responsibility for change, and harness a sense of urgency on campus—all elements of a kairotic moment (Wilber, 2016). What resulted was a redesigned course that took a transnational view of business communication and made some initial progress toward developing "the opportunity [for students] to interrogate their own understandings of the world, to consider how and why others may perceive things differently, and to position themselves and their experiences in the context of the 'other'" (Siczek & Shapiro, 2014, p. 330). Even if, as in the Global Business Communication partnership and in Arnold's (2016) study at AUB, not all participants are ready to challenge their own assumptions about language standards and multilingualism, I maintain that dialogue among faculty within and across disciplines is a critical first step toward a more inclusive view of language in the classroom.

In addition to describing the Global Business Communication collaboration in the context of kairotic moments, this chapter urges a reconsideration of traditional boundaries between scholarship and program administration. Such a reconsideration has long been promoted by Ernest Boyer (1990) and has been taken up in a position statement by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (2019). Program administrators, in the United States at least, have been widely seen by their institutions as merely doing service or management without creating new knowledge or shaping disciplinary questions in their fields. This chapter will illustrate a view of scholarship as administrative praxis, demonstrating how building campus or community partnerships, identifying kairotic moments, and engaging in action-oriented work raises new disciplinary questions and suggests directions for future scholarship.

Institutional Context

Boise State University is a mid-sized, doctoral-granting university with approximately 25,000 students, including undergraduates and graduate students. Boise, the largest city in Idaho, is in a county with 8.4% of residents over five years old who speak a language other than English. The percentage of the population of the neighboring county that speaks a language other than English at home is 18% (United States Census Bureau, 2018). Idaho was receiving an average of 1,000 to 1,100 refugees each year, until President Donald Trump put a temporary hold on refugee resettlement to the US. Nevertheless, formerly resettled refugees are included in Boise State's domestic student population.[1]

An important turning point in Boise State's institution-wide changes was a sharp increase in the number of international students from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait that the university experienced from approximately 2011 to 2017. The international student population (undergraduate and graduate), while still comparatively small, reached a peak of approximately 4% of the total student population (approximately 1,000 students) in 2015. The arrival of over 200 first-year students from Saudi Arabia in 2012 was met with a sense of urgency among many faculty across campus. It could easily be argued that the urgency derived from this predominantly white institution's resistance to a sudden ethnoracial demographic shift, but these new students also had relatively low English proficiency. Many had been admitted with an IELTS (International English Language Testing System) score of 5.0 or 5.5. A score of 5.0 is described by the IELTS organization as indicating a "modest user, with a partial command of the language, coping with overall meaning in most situations" (IDP: IELTS Australia, 2019). For comparison, most universities in the US set 6.5 as the minimum score for undergraduate admission. The top score is 9.0, described as an "expert user." On average, the early cohorts' Arabic academic literacy experiences were relatively limited: a widespread use of social media and a great deal of memorizing and reproducing from memory academic, poetic, and religious texts. Students frequently reported that they did almost no composing in school contexts. It was also unusual to find Saudi students who read longer texts for pleasure.[2] Many started their U.S. education in intensive English programs and, according to informal conversations with many students and their program advisors, were pressured to transition to academic coursework after only a year, no matter how little English they arrived with in the United States.

1   What portion of Boise State's student population came to the U.S as refugees is so far unclear. It was only very recently, through another partnership, between English Language Support Programs and the Admissions Office, that the institution began collecting data on refugee-background student numbers.

2   One exception was a student in my first-year writing class for multilingual students who revealed on Day One of the semester that he loved to read. From then on, his classmates called him "The Professor."

Boise State's international student population thus tripled in 4 years, going from having approximately 300 international students overall in 2011 to having over 900 international students in 2015, more than 50% of whom were from Saudi Arabia. This rapid increase seemed to draw more faculty attention to the presence of English learners and to raise faculty concerns about "preparedness." Hands were wrung; committees were formed; support staff were hired. As the Intensive English Program (IEP) instructor in this partnership described it, "The pushback and the panic created—it showed, it exposed a lot of things." The Business Communication Director added, "The [negative] response from faculty pushed me to want to address those issues." In our recorded discussion that is the basis for this chapter, all parties agreed that the influx of Saudi and Kuwaiti students was a catalyst for the desire to act—a kairotic moment.

My work as Director of English Language Support Programs had led me to a desire to act long before the Saudi and Kuwaiti students arrived. The university was experiencing what Jane Hill calls a language panic (2008) as a response to their relatively sudden arrival, but I had already known that we had a linguistically diverse U.S.-resident student population. Surveying over 1,200 students in first-year writing courses (FYW) at Boise State in 2015, we discovered that over 10% of those enrolled in FYW who were born in the US or arrived before the age of 18 (that is, unlikely to be international students on visas) said "no" to the question, "Do you consider yourself to be a native English speaker?" More recently, in spring, summer, and fall of 2019, the number of *U.S.-resident* undergraduate students admitted to the university that year who said English was not their native language was 1,651. Approximately 4,500 new first-year and transfer students are admitted each year. Although many admitted students do not end up matriculating, and although the notion of the "native speaker" is neither stable nor objective (see, for example, Canagarajah, 2013; Leung et al., 1997; Shuck, 2006), this information sheds light on the language diversity present among U.S.-resident students at Boise State.

The Director of Business Communication had long described to me his own sense of urgency and ethical responsibility to help our university move toward linguistically and culturally inclusive pedagogies and educational policies. In our respective contacts with faculty within and outside our respective colleges, we have seen wide variation in faculty receptiveness (or lack thereof) to teaching multilingual students who have not fully developed English proficiency. We also have numerous anecdotes—from students and their instructors—that many second-language learners at Boise State are struggling, even in the most receptive and inclusive classrooms. Identifying ways to respond to this need requires collaboration across units, as the need exists in all areas of the institution, from admissions to classroom teaching and assessment to the amount and structure of co-curricular and extra-curricular support.

The focus of the present chapter is one outcome of this collaboration, which might serve as a model of shared responsibility across an institution for equitably teaching

linguistically diverse student populations (see also Shuck, 2006, 2016). I worked with the Director of Business Communication (hereafter, "the Director" or "the BUSCOM Director") to enlist the support of the Center for Global Education, the Intensive English Program (IEP), and two other instructors in the College of Business and Economics (COBE) to orchestrate a redesign of the required, sophomore-level business communication course ("BUSCOM 201," for all COBE majors). The course would set aside its focus only on conventional U.S. genres of business communication and adopt a more explicit emphasis on global business practices and intercultural communication. Described in more detail in the next section, the partnership was the result of a number of kairotic moments that different stakeholders seized at different times.

The Global Business Communication redesign was implemented with this new cohort of Saudi students in mind. However, we also knew that monolingual, U.S.-born students, multilingual U.S.-resident students, and even instructors would benefit from such a globally focused course. The changes happened in two iterations: Iteration I was our first attempt to develop and offer a first-year, preparatory, language-support course, BUSCOM 101, to circumvent the English composition prerequisites and expedite entry into BUSCOM 201. Iteration II involved reflecting on the problems with that preparatory course model and then redesigning the required Business Communication course itself to focus on intercultural communication and global business practices.

Methods

The present chapter was originally intended as a co-authored narrative inquiry—a dialogue among the key members of this Global Business Communication partnership: the BUSCOM Director, the IEP Assistant Director, the two BUSCOM instructors who had most overtly expressed interest in revising the BUSCOM 201 course, and me. One of those instructors had earlier collaborated on developing the BUSCOM course that we thought would support this new Middle Eastern student cohort in learning the language of the discipline (see Iteration 1, below). I had invited all of the partners to co-author this chapter with me, in large part as an opportunity for all of us to reflect on the successes and failures of the revised course, as well as to reflect on the impacts of that redesign on our individual and collective thinking about language, the global nature of business communication, and institutional changes that might allow us to facilitate other such course redesigns.

We met as a group one time for approximately 90 minutes for this collective retelling and reflection, and I audio-recorded it with everyone's permission. One of the instructors, whom I refer to as Instructor #2, was not able to attend the in-person discussion, but she wrote responses to questions I had sent by email in advance to spark everyone's thoughts. These questions included the following:

1. What is your [individual] role in this Global Business Communication partnership, and when do you feel it began?
2. What is your understanding of the reasons why BUSCOM went global?
3. What have you learned from others in this collaboration?
4. What impacts has it had on your thinking about language or language learning?

Results

The data included here are excerpts from that mostly open-ended discussion of the development and impacts of this redesign, as well as a jointly produced narrative of the timeline of each member's role in the partnership. I also included some of Instructor #2's written responses. In the end, although I think a collaboratively authored chapter would have been productive, sparking additional reflection on language ideologies and the partners' responsibility for educating linguistically diverse populations, all of the partners bowed out and gave me their blessing to be sole author and accurately represent the partnership. They have all seen drafts of this chapter, and they have given me written permission to quote their words. Drawing on the framework of translingual dispositions (Horner et al., 2011; Lee & Jenks, 2016) and with a focus on the ideologies of monolingualism (Shuck, 2006) and of Standard English (Horner et al., 2011; Wiley & Lukes, 1996), I identify key kairotic moments and consider the potential of this type of redesign for future ideological transformation.

Iteration 1: Developing BUSCOM 101

English Language Support Programs (ELSP) was created because several faculty and staff wanted to serve English language learners more effectively across the curriculum. As ELSP Director, I had responded to these concerns in numerous ways, one of which was to develop a faculty learning community (FLC) program that allowed for sustained learning and community-building around the goal of developing linguistically inclusive pedagogies. I had led shorter-term workshops on this topic, several of which the BUSCOM Director had attended. He also joined the FLC on working with multilingual students in 2014–2015. He continues to maintain connections with those involved in inclusive education across campus.

In our recorded discussion, as we collectively recalled the timeline of how the Director and I came to see each other as allies in the fight for a linguistically and culturally inclusive campus, the Director added an angle that I had not remembered. He says,

> I think part of that process, too, was my attending the student presentations in the Language and Culture workshops that you even have—isn't it next week? And you know, listening to the students.

The Boise State Conference on Language, Identity, and Culture is a biannual collection of multilingual student presentations, designed to center the experiences and knowledge of multilingual students and, ideally, to educate faculty across the curriculum about their needs and strengths (Shuck, 2004). It pleased me to know that it played a role in the Director's growing understanding of the need for global perspectives on business communication.

The beginnings of an expanded partnership came when another BUSCOM instructor ("Instructor #1") joined a faculty learning community to discuss language and culture across the curriculum, adding that his "lifetime" of international experiences, including hosting exchange students from Taiwan numerous times, made him want to explore more cross-cultural teaching opportunities. Additionally, the IEP had just created a business communication course of its own, as many IEP students hoped to go into business-related majors. The IEP assistant director contacted the BUSCOM director for recommendations for an instructor who might be open to teaching in the IEP, even without necessarily having a second-language teaching background. That instructor later joined the Global Business Communication partnership and is referred to here as "Instructor #2."

Our first attempt to develop curricular support for the large number of Saudi students in business-related majors came during the 2015–2016 academic year, when internal grants became available from the additional funds from the Saudi government that accompanied the students who had received the King Abdullah Scholarship. Those funds needed to be used to support the Saudi students. The BUSCOM Director and I collaborated on a proposal in 2016 to use some of those funds to design an elective course, BUSCOM 101 Intercultural Business Language Development, which would help prepare monolingual and multilingual students alike for the discipline-specific language that would be used in the sophomore-level required business communication course and beyond. Although our first idea was to have it be specifically for second-language English users, we decided before submitting the proposal that BUSCOM 101 should be open to any student, removing the potential "ESL" stigma widely felt by multilingual students. To develop the course, the IEP assistant director drew on her considerable experience teaching in the IEP and coordinating an annual short-term visit by students from a Taiwanese university in a master of business administration program. The BUSCOM Director combined his extensive knowledge of the business communication curriculum with his desire to foster the development of "international-student champions" among the faculty. The new course, BUSCOM 101, was approved and added to the 2017–2018 university catalog.

The fall 2017 inaugural run of BUSCOM 101, however, was unsuccessful. Only three students registered for it, and so it had to be canceled. The partners reflected on the probable reasons for this failure and concluded that, despite what we imagined to be an appealing waiver of a prerequisite for BUSCOM 201 if a student

were to take BUSCOM 101 first, the 101 course still did not meet any requirement for graduation. We thus experienced a counterpart of kairos—*metanoia*—which played a significant role in the progress of this partnership. Metanoia is a sense of regret about a missed opportunity, but it is one that allows for reflection, empathy with another, and even transformation of beliefs that makes new kairotic moments possible (Myers, 2011). Kelly Myers argues that when an attempt to seize an opportunity fails, "the emotional impact of a missed opportunity motivates a transformation of thought, advancing a rhetor's understanding of the situation" (2011, p. 11).

Iteration II: Global Business Communication

Our reflections during the fall of 2018 were accompanied by two important developments. First, the members of this partnership increasingly focused our discussions on the ways that a cross-cultural experience would not only support multilingual English learners but also provide opportunities for U.S.-born monolingual students to experience a more globally relevant curriculum and learn to communicate across difference. The second significant development was that Boise State had just created the Center for Global Education. This was a crucial kairotic moment. As a member of the search committee for the director of this new center (hereafter "Assistant Provost"), I was able to let candidates know about the already strong relationship between English Language Support Programs and the IEP. After the Assistant Provost arrived, I arranged for a meeting between him and the Global Business Communication partners. We discussed the importance of drawing on multilingual students' experience with transnational and translingual mobility. The outcome of that meeting was another course redesign: focus the required BUSCOM 201 course not on U.S. business communication genres but rather on intercultural communication and business practices around the world. The BUSCOM Director explained some of the impetus for that redesign in this way:

> One of the things, as I was reading on multicultural, intercultural communication—one thing that just concerned me so much in so much of what I read was pointing out how poorly native English speakers were in intercultural communication, and the tendency not to make any accommodation for [pause] English language learners, nonnative speakers, whatever is the term of preference there. And that just seemed so important.

To persuade his colleagues in the College of Business and Economics of the importance of broadening BUSCOM 201 to be about communicating in global business environments, the Director developed a three-page document, "Why Take BUSCOM 201 Global?" (Appendix). In that document, he effectively illustrated

the already global nature of Idaho business, with its growing refugee and immigrant population and its participation in global trade. He also explicitly recognized the need for a global decentering of ownership of English, highlighting the notorious reputation of monolingual, native English speakers for being unable to communicate with speakers of non-standardized varieties of English.

Funding for the second curricular design (focusing on the required 201 course) came this time from the Center for Global Education, bringing Instructor #1 onto the redesign team in the summer of 2017. The revised course description, with the course title, Global Business Communication, was listed in the 2018–2019 university catalog. The following is the previous BUSCOM 201 course description:

> BUSCOM 201 BUSINESS COMMUNICATION. Effectiveness and correctness of writing and psychology of letter and report writing stressed through the preparation of a variety of business correspondence. Specific writing problems used in conjunction with various cases with realistic opportunities to develop writing skills following a designated style. Oral presentation skills included.

The prescriptivism evident in phrases such as "correctness of writing" and "following a designated style" is based on U.S.-centric understandings of what constitutes correctness, who designates the style, and what variety of English may be used.

The revised course description is as follows:

> BUSCOM 201 GLOBAL BUSINESS COMMUNICATION. Develop effective intercultural communication skills for business in the global economy. Expressive (writing and speaking) as well as receptive (reading and listening) skills will be included. Emphasis will be placed on developing credible, persuasive business cases that help guide informed business decisions.

The written comments contributed by Instructor #2 for this project make that shift clear. When asked what changes she had made in her teaching as a result of this partnership, she said:

> I've beefed up the electronic communication section to include a hands-on Zoom assignment to accommodate those participants in different geographic locations. I have two separate assignments to enhance intercultural awareness and sensitivity—creating a Team Building Activity based on an assigned country; and researching a country's communication practices, writing an essay and presenting to the class the similarities and unique differences between the US [and that country].

One can see that she creates space for genres that do not appear to be encompassed by the earlier course description ("letter and report writing"). She also facilitates cross-cultural comparisons of communicative expectations, providing important opportunities for students and instructors alike to reconsider their own perspectives on communicative norms. An example she raised in her comments illustrates this shift well.

> I was talking to the students about creating effective powerpoints [*sic*] and mentioned that humans are naturally drawn to reading the "normal" left to right and that our eyes are trained to view material in this manner. Silly me, having two in the class whose "normal" is Arabic, this concept clearly didn't apply.

Changes to the course also extended to rubrics and learning outcomes. One criterion both the Director and Instructor #1 use now for evaluation of assignments—spoken and written—is the extent to which the writing or presentation "communicates well to multicultural audiences." The Director recounted an incident in a BUSCOM 201 class in which a student team was discussing whether or not "RSVP" is idiomatic and would fail to reach people who acquired varieties of English in different contexts. Instructor #2 specifically pointed out that she now introduces the concept of ethnocentrism to her classes. Indeed, all of the BUSCOM instructors in this partnership mention examples of culturally specific references that they have come to realize might exclude certain audiences. A systematic assessment of the impact of Global Business Communication on students, beyond such anecdotes, will be a future step in the ongoing understanding of this course redesign.

In Support of Serendipity

In Michelle Cox et al.'s (2018) whole-systems approach to writing across the curriculum, the first step in developing what is likely to be a sustainable program is to understand the institutional landscape: who believes what, what concerns faculty and administrators are seeing, how much interest there is in collaboration to find solutions, etc. Actions can be planned from there, once a set of shared goals is negotiated. In my work with English Language Support, I have noticed a tension between my interest in seizing opportunities, on the one hand, and my desire to do a more thorough institutional assessment, on the other. The years-long partnership that the BUSCOM Director and I have built has been a sort of duet of understanding. Our different disciplinary perspectives may lead us to view inclusive education from different angles and to identify different responses to institutional situations, but we share common goals and concerns regarding equity among students of diverse language backgrounds, as well as an understanding of the need to expand U.S.-born,

monolingual students' understanding of the world beyond the US (and American English). A duet, however, is still just an echo of the more orchestral planning process that Cox et al. (2018) argue that program directors should implement.

Relying on kairos has been crucial in the transformation of the Business Communication program, keeping an eye out for opportunities when the need, urgency, responsibility, and potential responses align. A number of Boise State initiatives have come to fruition precisely because of the success of a kairotic moment, seized by individual, departmental, and other institutional agents. I did not begin my administrative work with a systematic assessment of all of the gaps in linguistic and cultural inclusion throughout the campus. However, I have brought together "natural allies" (Cox, 2014) across campus to come to a shared understanding and build plans of action. Indeed, kairos, supplemented by considerable disciplinary expertise, allowed us collectively to identify additional campus partners and implement a change. I therefore propose that kairos and whole-systems principles (Cox et al., 2018) can be part of the same recursive process.

Shyam Sharma and Gene Hammond (this volume), describing a transnational exchange that resulted from chance encounters, similarly argue that serendipity can be seized effectively. The disciplinary expertise of potential partners, they observe, can allow them to identify affordances rooted in local contexts. Alyssa Cavazos et al. (this volume) drew on such expertise to develop a four-part professional development series for teaching assistants that highlighted the local knowledge—especially the bilingual expertise—of the series participants. While the Boise State Global Business Communication partnership was on an intra-institutional scale rather than a transnational one, the implications of bringing such expertise to bear on our collaborations are similar. Each of us in the Business Communication redesign felt an ethical responsibility to act in order to serve all students well, and we envisioned different responses to this evolving context. The individual interactions and relationships we had built allowed us to share insights and information, which in turn allowed us to co-create an understanding of where the gaps and opportunities were. To transform ideologies around language, culture, and the scope of educational activity, in other words, requires keeping an eye out for that sly God of Opportunity.

Research as Administrative Praxis: Wrestling with Ideological Contradiction

Taking a global view of disciplinary work beyond the walls of any one institution allows students to "engage profoundly with their own situatedness, motivations, and biases" (Willard-Traub, 2018, p. 49). The building of the Global Business Communication partnership, as well as the documentation and analysis of the ways it came about, exemplifies a kind of research that not only informs institutional practice but that *is* institutional practice. In this case, the recorded interview/

discussion about the newly revised BUSCOM 201 course allowed for continued reflection among the BUSCOM faculty, particularly related to applying intercultural awareness to ideas about language. The ongoing reconsideration of language by the BUSCOM Director and the instructors is reminiscent of Nancy Bou Ayash's (2016) work on language representations and Simnitt and Tasker's (2022) study of ideological and pedagogical contradictions that can become visible with disciplinary boundary-crossing. The Director wrestled with his own competing ideological stances on language conventions, while Instructor #1 held firmly for most of the discussion to a dominant understanding of standardized language norms. It was only after the IEP assistant director urged linguistic flexibility, as opposed to what she called "rigidity," that Instructor #1 began to acknowledge different varieties of English.

The topic of cultural diversity and a question about how the members responded to writing led to a discussion of the singular "they" for individuals who have a gender identity outside the dominant gender binary. Bringing up grammatical change regarding gender led to the following comment from the BUSCOM Director:

> I readily confess that I'm struggling much, much more than I used to with how to deal with surface errors. I mean, it used to be that I would pounce on them immediately and pretty rigorously. Now I struggle with it. I don't want to say, "That's wonderful," if it's a fairly big, quote, "error." But on the other hand, I really do find if I can understand the message, I tend to be much more accommodating.

In the lengthy conversation that followed, both the Director and Instructor #1 grappled with their individual stances on language use. The Director was struggling to deal with "surface errors," but he suggested that comprehensibility and clarity were more important. After all, he wrote the following paragraph about the issue of language for the "Why Take BUSCOM 201 Global?" document:

> BUSCOM 201 needs to assist native English speakers to become better communicators in global English, especially when they are communicating with non-native English speakers. At the same time, BUSCOM 201 needs to assist non-native English speakers to improve their use of global English. In this respect, however, the primary focus will be placed upon clarity of the communication, not upon strictly following the rules of Standard American English grammar.

For Instructor #1, non-standard grammar use was not so much a matter of correctness, but rather, a matter of status-marking, echoing long-standing debates in education around language ideologies and *Students' Right to Their Own Language* (CCCC, 1974; Perry & Delpit, 1998; Flores & Rosa, 2015). In the

following comment, Instructor #1 describes an approach to grammar that focuses on comma splices and capitalization, which are common complaints among teachers of native English speakers:

> I think I have an obligation in teaching business communication to help our students recognize that those markers exist, and being successful not being—losing credibility based on surface things. So I'm still in the method of, you know, we mark the comma splices, we mark the random acts of capitalization, we mark all these things that are native and nonnative. But the nonnatives are going to have more of that stuff cropping up in their writing and, we're not gonna fix it all, but if I see patterns, then we'll have some interaction to say, "Watch for this, and here's why it is what it is," and hope that we build their skills.

Instructor #1 recognizes the importance of helping students who are still acquiring English to notice grammar patterns. However, the IEP Assistant Director challenges him on the issue of whether those same markers will have the same significance in a context not dominated by U.S. English speakers. This moment seemed to be a critical, pivotal one. Katie Silvester (2022) analyzes a series of such pivotal moments during a faculty orientation in the multilingual composition program she directs, arguing for what she calls a *pivotal praxis*, which can result in a transformative understanding of students' expertise and agency as users of multiple languages. Focusing on English as the primary language of global business communication, my colleagues in this collaboration began to wrestle with standardized English norms as the IEP Assistant Director offered the example of the highly international, multilingual context of Micron's microchip manufacturing headquarters in Boise. She says:

> [I]t's the microchips. It's the science. It's the knowledge of the field. If you get the point across, and you have a brilliant thing to say about the research, then no. It's more—I think there are lots of like government [contexts] and lots of things where that is like judged more harshly, but I think HP [Hewlett-Packard] and Micron? I don't think that's where they are.

To this, Instructor #1 responds, "I think it's a matter of degree." As he continues, he seems to be weighing his sense of responsibility to teach students about power and non-standard grammar against his understanding that English is a global language with diverse and ever-changing norms:

> I think if you use the right terms, not the right—if you use American standard terms, if you use American standard grammar,

then you're received in a way differently than if you don't use those standard things, but if you're in an environment where there are multiple language backgrounds and multiple usages of English, I think there'd be much more comfort with a wider circle of what's not deemed credibility-hurting language usage.

The back-and-forth about language and grammar among the Global Business Communication partners illustrates the inevitable tensions, at an individual and societal level, between representations of language as fixed and bounded, on one hand, and those that view language as dynamic, malleable, and fluid as it is used between language users (Bou Ayash, 2016). This exchange also highlights how the partnership and the research process are themselves a form of continued professional development. As in Meagan Weaver's (2019) study of shifts in language ideologies among college writing teachers as a result of professional development workshops, the Global Business Communication partners continued to think about their stances on language even during the research process itself.

This ongoing reflection constitutes an important part of what Tricia Serviss and Julia Voss (2019) describe as action-oriented writing program praxis that lies at the intersection of "expert" and "lay" practitioners in different disciplines. They urge us to push back against the false binary of administration and scholarship. Doing so presents a significant challenge for supervisors and promotion and tenure committees, raising issues of the institutional value of "service," a term often interpreted as doing the less valued work required to maintain institutional systems but not to advance scholarship or engage in institutional/community transformation. Boyer's (1990) model of scholarship accounts for such potentially transformative activities because it values the scholarship of application and engagement, in which disciplinary knowledge is constructed in the act of solving real-world problems.

To elicit broad participation, develop partnerships, identify allies and kairotic moments, and get a detailed view of how fertile the ground is for building programs takes significant time that is difficult to document. However, these activities are crucial for transforming education. The principle of equity that Cox et al. (2018) describe includes not only eliminating discriminatory practices but also valuing such work in material ways. Achieving equity also must account for the heavy burden disproportionately carried by women, people from marginalized backgrounds, and faculty and staff at lower academic ranks. The fact that I am the only tenure-line faculty member in the collaboration described here may play a role in whether Global Business Communication is sustainable.

This may signal another moment of metanoia—the regret at a missed opportunity. Although seizing kairotic moments led to the relative ease of getting the revised BUSCOM course through various curriculum committees, we had not done the methodical work of ensuring sustainability. However, we can assess the impact

of the course redesign on students and instructors, gathering data to share with prospective new partners from other disciplines. Kairos, then, can still serve as a useful component of a long-term, systematic approach to program development, as long as there is an interplay between those fleeting opportunities and the process of (re)planning and (re)evaluating. Kairos can be extremely effective in helping us identify key institutional moments—a new director, a sudden change in student demographics—and also potential allies who have individual, departmental, or institutional reach. During those moments, program leaders can collaborate with new agents, develop new and broader plans, and ultimately transform education.

References

Arnold, Lisa. (2016). "This is a field that's open, not closed": Multilingual and international writing faculty respond to composition theory. *Composition Studies, 44*, 72-88.

Bou Ayash, Nancy. (2016). Conditions of (im)possibility: Postmonolingual language representations in academic literacies. *College English, 78*, 555-577.

Boyer, Ernest. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Wiley & Sons.

Canagarajah, A. Suresh. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations.* Routledge.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1974). Students' right to their own language. *College Composition and Communication, 25*, 1-32.

Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2019). *Evaluating the intellectual work of writing administration.* https://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/242849/_PARENT/layout_details/false

Cox, Michelle. (2014). In response to today's "felt need": WAC, faculty development, and second language writers. In Terry Myers Zawacki & Michelle Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 299-326). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551.2.12

Cox, Michelle, Galin, Jeffrey, & Melzer, Dan. (2018). *Sustainable WAC: A whole systems approach to launching and developing writing across the curriculum programs.* National Council of Teachers of English.

Flores, Nelson, & Rosa, Jonathan. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*, 149-171.

Graban, Tarez Samra (2018). Contending with difference: Points of leverage for intellectual administration of the multilingual FYC course. In Shirley Rose & Irwin Weiser (Eds.), *The internationalization of U.S. writing programs* (pp. 97-115). Utah State University Press.

Hill, Jane H. (2008). *The everyday language of white racism.* Wiley-Blackwell.

IDP: IELTS Australia. (2019). IELTS 9-band scale. https://www.ieltsessentials.com/global/results/ielts9bandscale

Horner, Bruce, Lu, Min-Zhan, Royster, Jacqueline Jones, & Trimbur, John. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English, 73*(3), 303-321.

Jordan, Jay. (2021). Future perfect tense: Kairos as a heuristic for reconciliation. In Tony Silva & ZhaoZhe Wang (Eds.), *Reconciling translingualism and second language writing* (pp. 25-37). Routledge.

Kells, Michelle H. (2012). Welcome to Babylon: Junior writing program administrators and writing across communities at the University of New Mexico. *Composition Forum, 25.* http://compositionforum.com/issue/25/new-mexico-wpas-communities.php

Leung, Constant, Harris, Roxy, & Rampton, Ben. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 543-560.

Myers, Kelly. (2011). "Metanoia" and the transformation of opportunity. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 41*, 1-18.

Perry, Theresa, & Delpit, Lisa. (1998). *The real Ebonics debate: Power, language, and the education of African-American children.* Beacon Press.

Serviss, Tricia, & Voss, Julia. (2019). Researching Writing Program Administration expertise in action: A case study of collaborative problem-solving in transdisciplinary practice. *College Composition and Communication, 70*, 446-475.

Shuck, Gail. (2004). Ownership of texts, ownership of language: Two students' participation in a student-run conference. *The Reading Matrix, 4(3),* 24-39.

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

Shuck, Gail. (2016). What is ESL? In Rita Malenczyk (Ed.), *A rhetoric for writing program administrators* (2nd ed., pp. 78-91). Parlor Press.

Siczek, Megan, & Shapiro, Shawna. (2014). Developing writing-intensive courses for a globalized curriculum through WAC-TESOL collaborations. In Terry Myers Zawacki & Michelle Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second-language writers: Research towards Linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 329-346). The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551.2.13

Silvester, Katie. (2022). A pivotal praxis: Critical conversations to foster plurilingual awareness. In Kay Losey & Gail Shuck (Eds.), *Plurilingual pedagogies for multilingual writing programs: Engaging the rich communicative resources of U.S. students* (pp. 111-124). Routledge.

Simnitt, Emily, & Tasker, Thomas. (2022). Developing inclusive teaching across writing programs through asset-focused inquiry. In Kay Losey & Gail Shuck (Eds.), *Plurilingual pedagogies for multilingual writing programs: Engaging the rich communicative resources of U.S. students* (pp. 125-140). Routledge.

Weaver, Meagan. (2019). "I still think there's a need for proper, academic, standard English": Examining a teacher's negotiation of multiple language ideologies. *Linguistics and Education, 49*, 41-51.

Wilber, Daniel. (2016). *Inventing the wheel: Developing institution-wide support for resident multilingual writers* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Boise State University, Boise, Idaho.

Willard-Traub, Margaret. (2018). Writing programs and a new ethos for globalization. In Shirley Rose & Irwin Weiser (Eds.), *The internationalization of U.S. writing programs* (pp. 44-59). Utah State University Press.