INTRODUCTION.

WEC AND THE STRENGTH OF THE COMMONS

Chris M. Anson

North Carolina State University

In 1978, the farmers in Xiaogang, a small rural village in China, signed a secret pact that risked getting them all executed by the government. At that time, the government took all the food grown by the farmers and redistributed it nationally, but the farmers' share in return was so small that many of their families were near starvation. Worse, the government did not have enough local knowledge to allow the farmers to be productive, and mandated disastrous crop experiments (Dikötter, 2010) which, together with persistent droughts, had brought the village to near collapse. As farmer Yan Hongchan recalls, even the cows were too weak to plow (Dandan, 2018, para. 15).

Driven to desperation, Yan Hongchan called a special meeting in which the villagers decided to defy the government's system by signing a secret agreement that they would illegally farm their own small plots of land in addition to contributing to the Chinese collective farming program. This extra food would be distributed equally within the village without the knowledge of the government. If each family grew enough food for both the government and the needs of the new village collective, there was an additional benefit: they could also keep any surplus for themselves. The secret pact, which one of them hid inside a piece of bamboo on the ceiling of his mud house, had a provision that if any of the farmers were jailed or executed because of the plan, the rest would take care of their children.

Because the farmers were newly incentivized to do well for their own community, they redoubled their efforts, and the harvest—66,500 kg of rice—was greater than it had been for the five previous years combined (Xinhua News Agency, 2018). Local overseers soon noticed, and the news eventually reached the highest level of the Communist Party leadership. Mao-Zedong had recently died, or the farmers would likely have been severely punished or sentenced to death under his rule. But newly empowered Deng Xiaoping was interested in economic reform. When his government realized what was happening, instead of punishing the villagers, they studied their practices with interest and used their analysis to reform China's entire economic system. The result was over 500 million people being elevated out of

poverty—"the greatest economic advance the world has ever seen, and the greatest improvement in history in the living standards and life chances for ordinary people" (Pirie, 2018). The secret pact is now in a museum, and all Chinese schoolchildren learn the story of the farmers of Xiaogang (see also Eckholm, 1998).

For some economists, this case demonstrates one version of Garrett Hardin's (1968) "Tragedy of the Commons," more recently taken up by the late Nobel laureate Elinor Ostrom, which theorizes the tensions that arise between self-interest, the collective good, and who manages local decisions for a community. Ostrom critiques farming and herding analogies made by earlier scholars, some of whom argue that centralization—a "leviathan," or controlling agency—is required to avoid individuals' self-interest from interfering with collective goals (Ophuls, 1977), and to counteract the tendency for people to become "free riders," that is, enjoying the efforts of others without contributing. For example, Dandan (2018) explains that under the Chinese collective farming program, everyone was guaranteed the same wage, so that when some farmers put in less effort, the result was a "vicious cycle [sic]: Farmers worked at half-pace, crop yields fell, the state handed back less grain for food, and so farmers worked even slower" (para. 9). According to Jingchang, a signer of the document, "there was no incentive to work hard—to go out to the fields early, to put in extra effort" (Kestenbaum & Goldstein, 2012, para. 5).

In contrast, Ostrom argues that "tragedy" is likely to happen to the commons when some authority or power has a controlling interest in what local communities do or produce, but without understanding their context. "Missing from the set of accepted, well-developed theories of human organization," she writes, "is an adequately specified theory of collective action whereby a group of principals can organize themselves voluntarily to retain the residuals of their own efforts" (1990, p. 24). Without such a theory of self-governance and self-organization, "major policy decisions will continue to be undertaken with a presumption that individuals cannot organize themselves and always need to be organized by external authorities" (Ostrom, 1990, p. 25). For the farmers of Xiaogang, the imposition of a collective good (from above, and afar) was ignoring their local knowledge, subverting their incentive, and leading to a kind of passive resistance. But in contrast to a purely capitalistic and self-aggrandizing orientation in defiance of the communist farming program, the secret pact also meant providing for more than just one person or family's needs—it meant sharing the resources collectively within a particular community.

~~~

The writing-across-the-curriculum (WAC) movement has become one of the most enduring educational reforms in history, influencing curriculum and ped-

agogy across content areas and at every level from primary school to graduate programs (Russell, 2006). Survey research has shown that formal programs for WAC have grown dramatically across the U.S. and around the world (http://mappingproject.ucdavis.edu/). Long predicted to end up on the ash heap of bygone educational fads, WAC continues to develop in new directions and promote extensive research, theory, and instructional practices.

The WAC movement had its genesis close to the earth, in initiatives on small liberal-arts campuses like Central College in Pella, Iowa, where Barbara Walvoord reputedly held the first WAC workshop in 1970 (Walvoord, 2006), or at Carleton College in Minnesota, or at Beaver College (now Arcadia College) in Pennsylvania (McLeod & Soven, 1992). Wherever its true genesis, it is often characterized as a grass-roots movement, "a story of serendipity and community" (Bean, 2006, p. 115), something that sprang up from the fertile ground of small, student-oriented institutions and was nourished by those committed to teaching and learning—and then slowly spread.

Descriptions of these early programs are remarkably consistent. Typically, a group of energetic faculty began sharing ideas, usually through a coordinator with some charisma and a background in writing and pedagogy. As Russell (2002) explains, the impetus for these collaborations varied from small grant programs to a focus on admissions standards to an interest in assessing students' competencies. At the heart of the efforts, however, was a "bottom-up" orientation that inspired faculty to enhance their uses of writing in their own discipline-based courses. The contagion of their enthusiasm then led other faculty to join the often socially dynamic enterprise.

This model has effectively served the needs of many campuses, especially because there is something compelling about colleagues who share their inspiration and excitement about teaching with writing. But such programs sustain themselves only because someone is loudly trumpeting their causes: there is nothing particularly "institutional" about the activity. When the grant program dries up or the leader moves on to other pursuits or retires, or the sometimes modest funding for their course release(s) disappears, the effort often shrivels up or goes with them, leaving behind only the fond memories of a once vibrant collective dedicated to curricular and pedagogical change. Or the group never expands beyond a self-chosen few who work on writing in small interstitial curricular spaces, in the form of socially dynamic meetings that are open to all, but already solidifying into a kind of microculture with certain terms of membership. Students lucky enough to take courses with these enlightened faculty often come away with an intellectually rich experience and improved abilities. But many others miss out, and the scattershot nature of the entire endeavor fails to contribute to the broader, campus-wide enhancement of writing and other

communication practices. Instead, little verdant spaces for disciplinary writing are surrounded by a more barren curricular landscape.

The history of WAC eventually shows the establishment of the earliest organized programs, first in the form of institutional support for grass-roots efforts and then, inevitably, as systematic, campus-wide initiatives written into general-education or other curricular plans by or with administrators—who sometimes are beneficent stewards and sometimes behave like the park police. Broader concerns about intellectual development and engagement can be replaced by a preoccupation with the skills of writing and vocational preparation. Accompanying this normalizing is increasing concern for regularity and distribution of the effort imposed, like the Chinese collective farming program, by a central body. The popularity of writing-intensive programs partly reflects a desire to create and control a universal *requirement*, representing a shift away from the development of teachers and toward a focus on students' accumulation of credit hours. All eyes turn to the generic requirements for the design of courses as the context for implementation; the syllabus, not the instructor, earns certification from an overseer—a committee or administrative body charged with monitoring the program, which may do little to transform the way faculty integrate and support writing in their courses or learn strategies for accommodating a broad range of student needs and populations. Siloed in specific, required courses, writing may even disappear from non-WI courses. Faculty members' unchallenged, tacit assumptions about writing and writing instruction can block their ability or willingness to sustain instructional change around writing, and beyond the WI courses there may be no change at all. As they are assigned to different (sometimes untenured) faculty who often see them as an additional burden, or shuffled off on adjuncts, the courses can eventually lose their original writing intensity, as I learned from a newly-hired assistant professor at one institution who was required to teach all three different WI courses in her department, leaving no room in her schedule for courses in her area of expertise. As a result, course-based integration may fail to create systemic or sustainable change and perpetuates a binary between writing and content (where writing is "added on" to disciplinary coverage).

Of course, some excellent campus-wide WI programs have remained successful for decades. When such programs are supported over time, and when different faculty cycle through the teaching of WI courses (and are appropriately prepared to do so), they can create lasting change. But as Holdstein (2001) explains in "Writing Across the Curriculum and the Paradoxes of Institutional Initiatives," by the 1990s, leaders of the movement were attempting to address "the problems inherent in a double-edged trend: WAC's becoming a top-down phenomenon" (p. 43). Holdstein points to McLeod and Soven's (1991) concern

about the increased mandating of WAC and their anecdote about a writing program administrator who was told by her dean to deal with reluctant faculty by "ramming WAC down their throats" (p. 25). And as White lamented in a brief but oft-quoted article, "The Damage of Innovations Set Adrift," many unsupported WAC programs end up desiccated, leaving behind the dried up detritus of the program's once living initiative (White, 1990; see also Cox et al., 2018 on the sustainability of WAC programs).

When WAC is organized by structures outside individual departments and programs, whoever is responsible for implementation carries the burden—and it can be a heavy one—of "selling" the increased and enhanced use of writing down to the level of individual teachers. In that role, the leader may encounter faculty who resist WAC for a range of reasons, including feelings of inadequacy or unpreparedness to "teach" writing, fear that the focus will intrude on their coverage of material, worries about workload, or beliefs that the job of preparing writers should fall to writing teachers and that a "one-shot inoculation" should be adequate.

Over time, these problems have contributed to the demise of WAC on some campuses: over half of the WAC programs identified in 1987 had disappeared by 2007 (Thaiss & Porter, 2010). Many short-term, grant-funded, QEP-sanctioned, and personality-driven programs don't reach the level of sustainability to which they aspire (Cox et al., 2018). The reasons for the downfall of specific programs are many and complex: loss of leadership, loss of funding, faculty resistance to the effort, turnover of personnel, malaise, and lack of continued faculty development, to name a few. But the approach itself can also be to blame.

A few years after White expressed his dismay about the too-frequent disintegration of WAC programs, it became clear that the movement needed to evolve structurally, partly in response to these limitations and concerns about sustainability. McLeod et al. asked in *WAC for the New Millennium* (2011) how the movement would survive: "How will it grow and change—what new forms will WAC programs take [and] what new WAC theories and research will help lay the groundwork for future WAC programs?" (2001, p. 4). Their collection explored the future of WAC from political, curricular, and pedagogical perspectives, focusing especially on inter-unit collaborations, diverse student populations, emerging technologies, and various institutional initiatives such as service-learning.

Spurred on by these questions and the limitations of existing approaches, WAC leaders started to recognize that programs must be intentionally shaped to best match the cultures, missions, populations, disciplinary emphases, and faculty interests of specific institutions. Experiments have yielded portfolio models, vertical curricular models (see Yancey, Chapter 3 of this volume), individual

consultation models, writing fellows programs (see Bastian, Chapter 10 of this volume, and Hall & Hughes, 2011), tripartite models such as the program at the University of St. Thomas, which involves extensive development of faculty who then choose to teach general-education WI courses, writing-to-learn courses, and/or writing-in-the-disciplines courses—see https://www.stthomas.edu/wac/), and many other initiatives reflected in the wide range of activities documented in the WAC/WID Mapping Project (Thaiss & Porter, 2010). In addition, increasingly WAC began focusing more specifically on the needs, contexts, and genres of individual disciplines, resulting in an offshoot of WAC, writing in the disciplines (WID). But these efforts to explore the communities and genres of specific disciplines remained scattered and idiosyncratic, often motivated by department chairs or curriculum committees worried about students' unrefined writing abilities but unsure of what to do about the problem.

Unanticipated in *WAC for the New Millennium*, an ambitious and rapidly growing model[1] for college-level WAC programs sees the disciplinary unit of the *department* or *program* as the locus of activity. In this approach, a WAC leader or an institution decides to adopt the model and sets to work, often initially recruiting one or two departments that are the most eager to participate. Faculty within departments work together to define goals and outcomes, compare beliefs about writing, map their curriculum, plan for change, and decide how and when to collect data (the process is described in detail in many chapters in this volume). WAC experts serve as guides, listeners, and distillers of information—a role in stark contrast to those who police syllabi for adherence to WAC criteria or ensure that faculty are complying with some institutional requirements. Theoretically, this approach encourages ownership and responsibility; it recognizes disciplinary interests and the importance of complex, evolving genres of communication and varying departmental cultures; it understands differences in curricula, courses, and student populations; and it endorses the view that writing is learned within situated practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; New London Group, 1996; Russell, 1995). As departments join the effort, they can then influence and help other departments. Eventually, many departments are engaged, all of them working through their own processes of curricular revision, faculty development, and writing assessment.

Across higher education, there are many examples of individual departments that have decided to focus on writing (see Blank, Chapter 5 of this volume), and most WAC leaders can point to specific units on their campuses that have moved

---

1   Throughout this collection, authors use the terms "model," "approach," "program," "effort," "system," and "method" interchangeably to refer to various aspects or developments of the writing-enriched curriculum. Although each term carries some semantic distinctions, they all refer to the underlying principles of WEC.

well beyond whatever institutional structure and support may already exist. In some cases, for example, writing-intensive programs have inspired a department to go beyond the basic university requirement of one or two demand-based courses and have expanded their focus on writing internally. But *systematically* organized programs—that is, long-term endeavors in which eventually every department on a campus collectively focuses on the role of writing in its curriculum—are still rare. The chapter on "New Programmatic Directions" in the *Reference Guide to Writing Across the Curriculum* (Bazerman et al., 2005) describes the role of writing-intensive programs, writing centers, peer tutors and writing fellows, ESL programs, interdisciplinary learning communities, service learning, and e-CAC, but the departmentally localized model is not mentioned.

Although activity within specific departments focusing on writing has been a part of WAC from long before the start of the movement, the earliest known systematic, university-wide, departmentally-localized model was implemented on my own campus. In the late 1990s, North Carolina State University was experimenting with an approach to curricular implementation and assessment of learning that focused on and empowered individual departments and programs to engage in continuous improvement (Carter, 2002; see Gary Blank's full history in Chapter 5 of this volume, and Michael Carter's Foreword). As part of this broad interest in teaching and learning, NC State's Campus Writing and Speaking Program was established in 1997. In 1999, Deanna Dannels (as Assistant Director and expert in oral communication across the curriculum) and I (as Director) were hired to lead the program. The CWSP was created to help each department across the university to focus specifically on written and oral communication through the implementation of curricular plans, faculty development, and outcomes assessment (Anson, 2006; Anson et al., 2003). The departmental model became transformative because, with the help of our program, all decisions about expectations for student writing, plans to realize those expectations, and methods to assess the results of those plans were "uniquely shaped by the department, molded to best fit its faculty, students, and curriculum" (Anson & Dannels, 2018, p. 5).

The model involved extensive consultation with members of individual departments, first to help them articulate their expectations for student writing and oral communication, eventually framed as learning outcomes embedded in the acquisition of disciplinary knowledge. The next step in the process was to consider methods to reach the outcomes. Because the outcomes were aspirational, no department believed they were already accomplishing them, so the focus shifted to the creation of implementation strategies that might include faculty-development activities, extensive curricular mapping, surveys of how faculty contributed to the effort, and consultations with individual faculty about their

courses. The final stage involved figuring out ways to determine the effectiveness of the innovations.

As the success of this model became apparent, other campuses began to take notice and adapt it to their campus cultures. In 2006, inspired by the work at North Carolina State, the University of Minnesota began to pilot a structured model that they named the writing-enriched curriculum (WEC). With WEC, the University of Minnesota's WAC program, directed by Pamela Flash, created a faculty-directed set of procedures for the development, implementation, and ongoing assessment of undergraduate writing plans, collectively-authored documents that guide the curricular integration and assessment of relevant writing abilities (Anson, Dannels, et al., 2014; Flash 2016). This model, which Flash further describes in Chapter 1 of this volume, has established a portable, customizable, and sustained method for supporting curriculum-wide approaches to writing's integration, as other contributors to this collection describe.

The acronym "WEC," first branding the Minnesota program, is becoming the more generic term that characterizes the departmental model of WAC. This model is characterized by, at the least, the core features shown in Table 1 (collaboratively drafted with Pamela Flash), which are further elaborated and exemplified in this collection.

Table 1. Core features of the WEC model

Locus	Locates within academic departments and empowers and gives ownership to the faculty (and students) to name and describe relevant writing aims, and to determine their *curricular* integration and terms of assessment.
Orientation	Conceptually-oriented: recognizes the power of writing-related assumptions to drive or block the integration of writing instruction across the disciplines and is designed to draw out often tacit knowledge about writing that defines ways of knowing and doing in the discipline.
Data use	Collects local data (including writing assignments, student writing, survey data, direct assessment of student writing) and involves faculty in recurring episodes of data interpretation and analysis.
Mediation	Involves an intermediator (a writing expert) who facilitates the work of articulating writing knowledge, planning interventions, assessing results, and engaging in an ongoing partnership with departmental stakeholders.
Support	Is bolstered by the ongoing partnership of writing and teaching support offices, and by administrative, financial, and other support for individual units, but is not entirely dependent on these.
Sustainability	Promotes long-term practices, scales gradually, is sensitive to internal change and inertia, and periodically or regularly revisits and revises the original efforts.

Although developed in response to localized needs, the models at North Carolina State University and the University of Minnesota are being successfully implemented on university and college campuses across the US and in Europe. For example, along with the institutions represented in this collection, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Eastern Oregon University, McDaniel College, Bielefeld University, Stephen F. Austin State University, Elon University, the University of Mississippi, and others have been implementing programs, in most cases directly through the help of the co-editors. The approach has gained such interest that symposia organized at the University of Minnesota have attracted attendees from dozens of institutions who want to strategize efforts on their own campuses, and my orientation toward the approach has met with strong interest at the newly established WAC Institute sponsored by the Association for Writing Across the Curriculum (https://www.wacassociation.org/).

This collection is the first volume to bring together theory, research, and campus-specific examples of the writing-enriched curriculum—the faculty-driven and departmentally focused model of WAC/WID implementation. The purpose of the collection is to inform writing program administrators, teachers, scholars, and university officials about the potential of the model to transform the way writing is used and supported across all courses and curricula in higher education. The collection includes theoretically grounded accounts of departmentally focused writing- or communication-across-the-curriculum programs, including localized research that demonstrates the effectiveness of the model. The result of targeted solicitations of WAC/WID coordinators who have implemented departmentally focused efforts on their campuses yielded ten chapters alongside the co-editors'.

The essays are divided into three sections. The first section provides the historical, theoretical, and curricular principles and methods that define the WEC model, grounded in extended descriptions, analyses, and research from its implementation. In Part Two, four chapters further theorize the WEC model through explorations of the authors' own implementation efforts. Part Three then considers the WEC model in the context of other initiatives and programs.

Instead of including descriptions of each chapter here, we asked authors to provide previews that precede the body of their chapters. Readers can use these to guide their selection of chapters to read (or to reorder the sequence of chapters) based on their particular interests.

~~~

It would be unprincipled to compare the plight of the farmers in Xiaogang during the 1970s—laboring under oppressive rules and threatened with imprisonment or execution for disobedience—with the context of higher education institutions, or any academic department, no matter how marginalized it feels

in the institution's hierarchy or how put upon to do things it doesn't want to do. Nor do the economic reforms precipitated by the farmers of Xiaogang absolve the Chinese government of continuing concerns about human rights. But there is also a lesson in the famous story, not only for those leading WAC programs but for those leading most curricular and pedagogical reforms: incentive has its roots in what matters locally—in ownership and personal investments in work. In turn, the resulting energy and inspiration will contribute to the collective good. At the same time, the sustainability of such localized efforts is usually guaranteed only through partnerships with a central administration. Too many organically grown programs or initiatives have failed from lack of funding or other support. WEC programs work effectively with faculty ownership recognized and supported by upper administrations and through essential partnerships with WAC experts and their programs, which can help with significant bureaucratic and infrastructural needs (communication and follow-through, web support, materials, meeting arrangements, budgeting, and the like).

When members of academic departments and programs are inspired to focus on writing and how best it should be integrated into their curricula and their goals for students' success, and are given the support needed to bring out their understandings and examine their practices, they rise to the challenge in remarkable ways. Decades of compartmentalization and the association of writing with people outside of their disciplinary contexts have denied them the rights of ownership—of deciding what their students should be able to do, on their own terms, and then figuring out how best they can achieve those goals in their own ways. In sharing the successes of those who have contributed to this volume, as well as the challenges they have overcome or are struggling to overcome, it is our hope that this collection documents a new approach to WAC that can lead other institutions and their departments toward the kinds of transformations that result in entire cultures of writing—within and across academic and co-curricular units.

REFERENCES

Anson, C. M. (2006). Assessing writing in cross-curricular programs: Determining the locus of activity. *Assessing Writing, 11*, 100-112.

Anson, C. M., Carter, M., Dannels, D. P., & Rust, J. (2003). Mutual support: CAC programs and institutional improvement in undergraduate education. *Journal of Language and Learning Across the Disciplines, 6*(3), 26-38. https://doi.org/10.37514/LLD-J.2003.6.3.06

Anson, C. M., & Dannels, D. P. (2018). Handing over the reins: Ownership, support, and the departmentally-focused model of communication across the curriculum. In M. Cox, J. Galin, & D. Melzer, *Sustainable WAC: A whole systems approach to launching and developing WAC programs* (pp. 5-7). National Council of Teachers of English.

Anson, C. M., Dannels, D. P., Flash, P., & Gaffney, A. H. (2012). Big rubrics and weird genres: The futility of using generic assessment tools across diverse instructional contexts. *Journal of Writing Assessment,* 5(1).

Bazerman, C., Little, J., Bethel, L., Chavkin, T., Fouquette, D., & Garufis, J. (2005). *Reference guide to writing across the curriculum*. Parlor Press; The WAC Clearinghouse. https://wac.colostate.edu/books/referenceguides/bazerman-wac/

Bean, J. C. (2006). Montana, Mina Shaughnessy, and microthemes: Reflections on WAC as a community. In S. H. McCleod & M. I. Soven (Eds.), *Composing a community: A history of writing across the curriculum*. Parlor Press.

Blank, G. B. (2021). Forty years of writing embedded in forestry at North Carolina State University. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.27514/PER-B.2021.1299.2.05

Carter, M. (2002). A Process for establishing outcomes-based assessment plans for writing and speaking in the disciplines. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, *6*, 4-29. https://doi.org/10.37514/LLD-J.2003.6.1.02

Carter, M. (2021). Foreword. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.27514/PER-B.2021.1299.1.2

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.

Dandan, N. (2018, August 21). The farmer who changed China forever. *Sixth Tone*. http://www.sixthtone.com/news/1002783/the-farmer-who-changed-china-forever

Dikötter, F. (2010). *Mao's Great Famine: The history of China's most devastating catastrophe, 1958–62*. Walker.

Eckholm, E. (1998, September 19). Xiaogang journal; village of small farmers marks own great leap. *The New York Times*, A4. https://www.nytimes.com/1998/09/19/world/xiaogang-journal-village-of-small-farmers-marks-own-great-leap.html

Flash, P. (2016). From apprised to revised: Faculty in the disciplines change what they never knew they knew. In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *A Rhetoric of reflection* (pp. 227-249). Utah State University Press.

Flash, P. (2021). Writing-enriched curriculum: A model for making and sustaining change. In C. M. Anson & P. Flash (Eds.), *Writing-enriched curricula: Models of faculty-driven and departmental transformation*. The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.27514/PER-B.2021.1299.2.01

Xinhua News Agency. (14 October 2018). *Forty years on, Xiaogang still testbed of China's economic reform*. China Daily. https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/201810/14/WS5bc32642a310eff30328237b.html

Hall, E., & Hughes, B. (2011). Preparing faculty, professionalizing fellows: Keys to success with undergraduate writing fellows in WAC. *The WAC Journal*, *22*, 21-40. https://doi.org/10.37514/WAC-J.2011.22.1.03

Hardin, J. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, *162*(3859), 1243-1248.

Holdstein, D. (2001). "Writing across the curriculum" and the paradoxes of institutional initiatives. *Pedagogy*, *1*(1), 37-52.

Kestenbaum, D., & Goldstein, J. (2012). The secret document that transformed China. National Public Radio, https://www.npr.org/sections/money/2012/01/20/145360447/the-secret-document-that-transformed-china

McLeod, S., & Miraglia, E. (2011). Writing across the curriculum in a time of change. In S. H. McCleod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs* (pp. 1-27). National Council of Teachers of English.

McLeod, S., & Soven, M. (1991). What do you need to start—and sustain—a writing-across-the-curriculum program? *WPA: Writing Program Administration, 15*, 25-34.

McLeod, S., & Soven, M. (1992). *Writing across the curriculum: A guide to developing programs.* Sage.

Nandan, N. (2018, August 21). The farmer who changed China forever. *The Sixth Tone.* http://www.sixthtone.com/news/1002783/the-farmer-who-changed-china-forever

New London Group (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard educational review*, *66*(1), 60-93.

Ophuls, W. (1977). *Ecology and the politics of scarcity.* Freeman.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action.* Cambridge University Press.

Pirie, M. (2018). The document that changed the world. https://www.adamsmith.org/blog/the-document-that-changed-the-world

Russell, D. R. (1994). American origins of the writing-across-the-curriculum movement. In C. Bazerman & D. R. Russell (Eds.), *Landmark essays on writing across the curriculum* (pp. 3-22). Hermagoras Press.

Russell, D. R. (1995). Activity theory and its implications for writing instruction. In J. Petraglia (Ed.), *Reconceiving writing, rethinking writing instruction* (pp. 51-77). Erlbaum.

Russell, D. R. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history* (2nd ed.). Southern Illinois University Press.

Russell, D. R. (2006). WAC's beginnings: Developing a community of change agents. In S. H. McLeod & M. I. Soven (Eds.), *Composing a community: A history of writing across the curriculum* (pp. 3-15). Parlor Press.

Schoolland, K. (2012). The China model: Is it a golden formula? *Economic Affairs*, *32*(2), 88-90.

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.

Walvoord, B. E. (2006). Gender and discipline in two early WAC communities: Lessons for today. In S. H. McLeod & M. I. Soven (Eds.), *Composing a community: A history of writing across the curriculum* (pp. 142-156). Parlor Press.

White, E. M. (1990). The damage of innovations set adrift. *AAHE Bulletin, 43*(3), 3-5.