

Introduction: L2 Expertise in Curriculum Internationalization

Matthew Allen, Estela Ene, and Kyle McIntosh¹

Internationalization has been a driving force in higher education for several decades now. It is an enormously complex phenomenon, requiring stakeholders to balance financial imperatives with educational outcomes in dynamic geo-political, economic, and social environments. As colleges and universities around the world continue to internationalize in terms of student populations, research programs, and institutional partnerships, the curriculum cannot remain wedded to a unidirectional model that aims primarily to help international students adapt to the existing norms and expectations of the university community without requiring the university to adapt to its own shifting demographics. Too often, linguistic and cultural differences continue to be seen as problems to be solved rather than resources that can contribute to what should be the goals of internationalization: improved communication, better understanding, and more meaningful exchanges among people of diverse backgrounds. Universities need to recognize the importance of these goals by building more globally aware programs and pedagogies into the local campus that make transformative outcomes available to everyone. This book provides case studies from a variety of higher educational contexts to represent the diverse ways that second language (L2) specialists build up programs and courses that contribute to their institutions' internationalization by promoting language and cultural exchange.

¹ Authors listed in alphabetical order contributed equally to the writing of this chapter.

Internationalization of Higher Education

Internationalization of higher education (IoHE), in de Wit and Hunter's (2015) revision of Jane Knight's (2003) definition, is "the *intentional* process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, *in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society*" (p. 3, italics in original). Although it has been motivated in part by the promise of increased tuition dollars and other forms of revenue, IoHE has the merit that it facilitates more diverse exchanges of knowledge among researchers and better prepares students to live and work in the global environments of the twenty-first century (Hudzik, 2011).

IoHE has been occurring in the larger context of the increased mobility created by a globalized economy that, over the last thirty years, has led many people to pursue international higher education as a way to gain access to better opportunities at home and abroad. According to the Open Doors report compiled by the Institute of International Education (2019), over 340,000 university students in the U.S. studied abroad as part of their degree program in 2017/18 (with most studying for less than an academic or calendar year). Many students from other countries also come to the U.S. and elsewhere for short or mid-term study abroad, or to pursue degrees as international undergraduate and graduate students. Although international student enrollment at U.S. universities has slowed down in terms of annual percentage growth since in 2015/16, there were still 1,095,299 international students in the U.S. during the 2018/19 academic year (Institute of International Education, 2019). Similarly, in 2017, there were 1.7 million students from abroad in universities across the 28 states of the European Union (Eurostat, 2019).

Internationalization Abroad and at Home

IoHE is a complex phenomenon which comprises two main areas: internationalization *abroad* and internationalization *at home*. Internationalization abroad entails student mobility, academic credit and degree mobility (such as dual/transfer credit between international institutions and dual degree programs), as well as staff and faculty mobility (e.g., international hirings, visiting scholars). Internationalization at home (IaH) refers to the internationalization of campuses not only through the recruitment of international students, but also through the internationalization of the curriculum and co-curricular activities. Simply put, *internationalization abroad* relies mainly on sending a relatively small number of students or faculty to destinations abroad, while *internationalization at home* refers to efforts to bring international experiences and global perspectives to all students and faculty at a college or university as part of their “normal” campus activities (Nilsson, 2003). Both ways of pursuing internationalization have merit and can be implemented to lead to transformative, measurable learning outcomes (Deardorff, 2015).

Increasingly, scholars and institutions recognize that the relatively few students who have the opportunity to study abroad are not the only ones who can benefit from participating in meaningful international educational experiences (Landorf, Doscher, & Hardrick, 2018). Academic and local communities stand to gain far more than revenue from the participation of international students (Castro, Woodin, Lundgren, & Byram, 2016; Charles & Deardorff, 2014). Their peers and teachers, as well as others in the communities where these international students live, work, or volunteer, also stand to develop more global mindsets and intercultural competence, for the benefit of all (Jones, 2013). While not always tied to linguistic outcomes, IaH itself is defined as “the purposeful integration of international and *intercultural dimensions*

into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments” (Beelen & Jones, 2015, p. 69; emphasis added).

The intentional, purposeful pursuit of international and intercultural dimensions is a crucial aspect of IaH, and one that counters certain myths about internationalization. For example, conventional wisdom has long held that students who depart their home for educational experiences abroad will be immersed in rich language and cultural learning environments, and that such immersion will automatically lead to transformative international experiences. Unfortunately, current scholarship shows this assumption to be more myth than reality (Castro et al., 2016; Vande Berg et al., 2012). This “immersion myth” ignores the complexities and difficulties that many students face in terms of their linguistic and intercultural development (DeKeyser, 2007; Hammer, 2012). It also tends to exaggerate the role of study abroad in campus internationalization (Charles & Deardorff, 2014). Even at universities with large numbers of international students, IoHE initiatives often do not sufficiently consider the contributions of their diverse student population. Philosophically, such oversights may arise from viewing international students from a deficit perspective, which holds that successful academic and research activity can only begin once this population has been linguistically and culturally remedied (Benzie, 2010; Siczek & Shapiro, 2014). When institutions do not commit to the academic, social, and personal needs of international students, there is a greater potential for their exclusion or exploitation (Sherry, Thomas, & Chui, 2010). Clearly, the mere presence of international students on a campus cannot guarantee internationalization outcomes “at home.”

An ongoing and important challenge is figuring out how to incorporate international perspectives into established disciplinary programs, courses, and instruction (Castro et al., 2016). Curriculum internationalization involves the integration of global perspectives and learning goals

into course design and instruction, but it presupposes that campus administration will ensure the necessary professional development of the faculty involved. Capacity also needs to be built for extra- and co-curricular activities that are geared towards internationalization. Educational reform at this level is no easy endeavor, but it is a worthy, even necessary one (Hudzik, 2011), as the true goal of internationalization is to benefit all those involved (Hudzik, 2011; Charles & Deardorff, 2014).

Finally, the development of not only second language (L2) proficiency but also intercultural competency for all are at a high premium in IaH. Second language (L2) proficiency and intercultural competency develop from a complex, dynamic set of interactions among students, their educational environments, and the educators who support them. There are many ways for students to develop L2 proficiency and intercultural competence, but these opportunities require intentional, research-inspired contributions from L2 learning specialists, applied linguists, content-area faculty, and host-country community (Jackson, 2018). For students to develop the skills, knowledge, and attitudes that are the desired outcomes of internationalization, they need training and support before, during, and after their international educational experiences (e.g., Engle & Engle, 2012; Galante, 2014).

IaH implies that any program or field can, to a certain extent, target the development of intercultural competence. As Vande Berg, Paige, and Lou (2012) emphasize, all learning experiences are situated in specific cultural and linguistic contexts. They therefore prioritize intercultural learning and development in their influential volume on learning in study abroad, making the point that students will get much more out of their trips abroad if they are prepared and appropriately by educators. By the same token, educators teaching in their home departments should consider how their own praxis is culturally bound and how they can more effectively

engage with diverse student populations. Resources they can use as catalysts to revise or expand their praxis include the AAC&U (2009) VALUE rubric for Intercultural Knowledge and Competence, Jane Jackson's (2014) textbook *Introducing Language and Intercultural Communication*, and Kate Berardo and Darla Deardorff's (2012) edited volume, which provides research-based frameworks and learning activities for trainers and educators who need to prepare students to have meaningful intercultural encounters.

As we argue below, it is important to recognize that second language specialists and programs are a vital resource for training other faculty, collaborating across academic units, and spearheading co-curricular activities, as they possess the necessary expertise and are already organically implementing internationalization for the benefit of faculty and students "at home."

The Role of Second Language Specialists and Programs in IoHE/IaH

The importance of intercultural and linguistic competence in internationalization signals the crucial role of language and culture professionals and programs in IoHE efforts. As L2 specialists working with international students on our respective campuses, we have been considering the following questions independently, and now together:

1. How do international students bring diversity to our campuses?
2. How can international diversity be more widely shared with domestic students?
3. How do we bring international students to experience diversity on our campuses?

Given the global push for IoHE, we know that many colleagues around the world would be pondering similar questions in their own educational contexts. This volume takes a step toward finding answers by presenting case studies that illustrate how L2 faculty, administrators, and programs have contributed to IoHE on their campuses in impactful ways.

The impetus for this volume is our own experiences as L2 specialists engaged in English as a Second Language (ESL) program administration and instruction on our respective campuses, where we have witnessed the opportunities and challenges of IoHE in various ways. At the student level, we have witnessed both positive and negative instances of diverse students figuring out how to work together or build friendships. We have also talked extensively with colleagues and faculty from other disciplines about the challenges of fostering engagement among diverse students for mutual benefits and about accounting for linguistic and cultural differences. Based on such realities, we have worked on our campuses to explore practical approaches to how language and cultural differences among students can become opportunities to enrich and enhance the quality of postsecondary education for all students and faculty, rather than barriers to communication and understanding.

For example, Ene has been tapped by leadership in the Division of Undergraduate Education and the Office of International Affairs at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) to co-lead a faculty community of practice on intercultural learning meant specifically to provide professional development for faculty across campus in order to raise their intercultural competence and equip them with the pedagogical knowledge needed to raise their students' intercultural competence. Grounded in applied linguistics and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Ene, who directs and teaches in the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) Program and the MA in TESOL at IUPUI, engaged the faculty community of practice in reading/discussion sessions, small and large group workshops, action research on intercultural engagement, and social activities with domestic and student participation. The community participated in a campus-level Welcoming Campus Grant with an overall orientation towards multiculturalism and inclusion, in which the community of practice

represented the argument for creating a welcoming campus for international as well as domestic multicultural students. In the EAP Program, Ene has led curricular revisions to promote collaborations between EAP courses and content courses across the curriculum around service learning and writing projects.

At Purdue University, Allen has overseen curriculum and course development in the Purdue Language and Cultural Exchange (PLaCE) since its inception in 2014. The initial scope of the program was to support a subset of incoming first-year students to develop more advanced English language proficiency and cultural competency through a two-semester sequence of credit-bearing courses. In response to demand from faculty and students to expand its support, Allen guided the development of a range of non-credit classes and workshops, which are open to all international graduate and undergraduate students at the university, and has worked with campus partners to develop revenue-generating English language institutes and summer programs.

As an assistant professor of English and Writing at the University of Tampa, McIntosh has redesigned undergraduate academic writing courses to facilitate the mainstreaming of ESL students while providing them with additional language and cultural support in the form of credit-bearing writing workshops. Working in the TESOL certificate program, he has helped to create opportunities for domestic and international students to interact through peer-to-peer tutoring and community outings, including regular Friday lunches and occasional trips to local attractions.

Based on our experiences and observations of trends in HE, L2 specialists and programs contribute to and benefit from conversations about how to further IaH efforts. L2 specialists are inherently sensitive to many aspects of internationalization, especially in relation to student-

facing efforts (e.g., designing pedagogical applications that target intercultural competence and language learning; understanding students' experiences preparing for and studying in international contexts). L2 specialists also tend to be teachers who know how to teach multicultural student populations and approach cultural difference and diversity. Many are teacher trainers who know what other teachers need to know to successfully engage international and domestic students. They include program administrators who understand their diverse student populations in the larger campus and social context.

We readily acknowledge that this expertise is not exclusive to those who have a background in applied linguistics/TESOL/second language studies or roles in ESL/EAP programs, but this volume recognizes the work of L2 specialists with such backgrounds first and foremost because this is our community of practice. However, collaborations with specialists from related fields and programs (writing/rhetoric and composition, for example) are featured. Thus, our book is an effort to contribute to unified discussions: (1) among L2 specialists, who tend to see themselves or frame their work in terms of their specialty or type of program (e.g., EAP, reading, ITA support); (2) among those in higher education who tend to orient toward their disciplinary values, conventions, and practices; and (3) among L2 specialists and other educators who may find it challenging to make meaningful curriculum changes to incorporate international diversity. Ultimately, comprehensive internationalization means that everyone at the institution needs to be involved by finding common ground while still maintaining their distinct academic identities and ways of knowing. We believe that the bigger tent of IoHE provides room for L2 specialists in specific departments (e.g., English or world languages) to find common ground with fields that share many common interests (such as world language, intercultural communication, or study abroad).

Although scholars have pointed out that internationalization “should no longer be considered in terms of a westernized, largely Anglo-Saxon, and predominantly English-speaking paradigm” (de Wit & Jones, 2014), in most cases it continues to be tied to learning English (Weiser & Rose, 2018, p.4). The influx of international students to universities in English-dominant countries solidifies the need to learn English before and during the students’ stay, strengthening its status as a global lingua franca. At the same time, in order to remain competitive, higher education institutions across the globe have had to internationalize (de Wit & Hunter, 2015), in many cases offering English-medium instruction to attract international students, which further highlights the need for English proficiency and intercultural competence. Both situations illuminate the centrality of the English language—and those who specialize in teaching it—to internationalization initiatives. However, few nods have been given in internationalization studies to the crucial role that English language professionals and programs play in internationalization initiatives. Likewise, within their home fields, language and culture scholars and practitioners have failed to label their own work as significant to internationalization, perhaps seeing much of it as “business as usual.”

The Current Volume

Purpose

Our book aims to bring to the forefront the contributions of those working in various language-related fields within higher education that go beyond “just teaching English” and toward preparing the global citizens of the future. We see this volume as contributing to emerging interdisciplinary conversations in higher education about how to refine internationalization in terms of praxis and how to coordinate curricular and pedagogical efforts

to achieve meaningful learning outcomes for all students. The work presented in this volume is relevant to several areas in higher education research and practice that share interests and values in regards to student learning and internationalization, including intercultural communication, writing studies, study abroad, virtual exchange, and academic support. Because of disciplinary and administrative boundaries, such works may not otherwise be presented side by side. Thus, we hope that our volume fosters further conversation across disciplinary and administrative silos in higher education.

Recent contributions by scholars in writing studies and applied linguistics, some of them administrators of writing or ESL/EAP programs and centers, have made an explicit connection between professionals in these areas and internationalization. For example, *The Internationalization of US Programs* edited by Shirley Rose and Irwin Wiser (2018) features their own work and that of other Writing Program administrators' with interdisciplinary grounding in writing studies, applied linguistics, and TESOL (such as Christine Tardy and Susan Miller-Cochran, David Martins and Stan Van Horn, Gail Shuck and Daniel Wilber, Paul Matsuda and Catherine O'Meara -- some cited in this volume's chapters). Collectively, their work illustrates "that thinking about a changing student population has led them to recognize that revised administrative structures, curricular revisions, and new professional-development programs improve teaching and learning not just for international students but for all students" (Wiser & Rose, 2018, p.7). The book recognizes prior volumes on the teaching of international and other multilingual students in university-level composition programs: Horner, Lu, and Matsuda's *Cross-Language Relations in Composition* (2010), Jay Jordan's *Redesigning Composition for Multilingual Realities* (2012), and Zawacki and Cox's *WAC and L2 Writers* (2014). However, few of these publications explicitly relate the work presented

to internationalization (for example, Siczek & Shapiro's chapter in Zawacki & Cox (2014)), and only Wisner & Rose (2018) did so in the title of their edited book.

As we were working on the current volume, we became aware of Lape's (2020) book on *Internationalizing the Writing Center: A Guide for Developing a Multilingual Writing Center*. Such work, while groundbreaking, contends in only an implicit way with aspects of teaching English to international students in the context of writing courses, while at the same time internationalizing the writing curriculum. We also read Bond's (2020) *Making Language Visible in the University: English for Academic Purposes and Internationalisation*, in which the author argues that language learning is vital to internationalization efforts and must be foregrounded across the curriculum. Bond suggests several promising strategies for doing so (e.g., connecting academic and social support), but the book focuses mainly on a single institutional context and the disconnect that exists there between those who specialize in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and their colleagues in other disciplines. We agree that more needs to be done to bridge such gaps. We also feel that it is important to recognize successful attempts to integrate English-language-learning international students into the campus through the curriculum or co-curriculum, and shine light on positive examples of leveraging the expertise of teachers, researchers and administrators who work with these students. Such is the motivation for our work on our respective campuses, as well as this volume.

Overview of Chapters

The chapters included in this volume identify specific, innovative ways to work on the outcomes of IoHE/IaH from the perspectives of L2 specialists, program administrators, and students. We encouraged the authors to take a grounded approach to writing about internationalization efforts "where they live." Framing internationalization within the work they

do on their campus, the authors in this volume examine institutional internationalization through the lenses of language learning and intercultural competence. Each chapter offers a distinct perspective on L2 learning and the intercultural development of adult learners in different academic settings. Taken together, they provide suggestions for how L2 specialists can take their work beyond their individual programs to help internationalize the entire university in ways that lead to improved learning outcomes for students at different points in their degree program, including:

- Orientation programs (early arrival on campus, before classes start)
- Language Center contexts (support during studies)
- Volunteer programs for International Teaching Assistants (ITA) and undergraduate students
- Graduate-level writing support structures
- Instructional design (virtual learning spaces)
- Virtual Partner program (co-curricular)
- Intercultural composition (placement, interdisciplinary collaborations)

By focusing on the question of how to best support and integrate multilingual, international students at the undergraduate and graduate levels, both inside and outside of academic courses, this book offers options and approaches that have been developed to fit the needs and circumstances of a specific context, but which could be adapted for other other contexts.

The chapters in Section 1 detail efforts at four universities to revise the curriculum in innovative ways that resist the deficit model of language learning and cultural knowledge by providing academic support for international students beyond so-called “remedial” classes and working to foster greater collaboration with their domestic peers. In Chapter 2, Chiocca, Davies,

Davies, Hiller, Naghib, Sprague, and Zhang address the immersion myth head-on by addressing the need for explicit instruction in language and intercultural awareness from the moment students arrive on campus. The authors give an overview of the four-day long student orientation program at Duke Kunshan University (DKU) which has students work on collaborative, community-based, bilingual (Chinese and English) activities and discussions. Preliminary survey findings indicate high levels of satisfaction and preparedness among all participating students.

Even with innovative orientation programs in place, students continue to need language and culture support throughout their studies. Often, this comes in the form of a one- or two-semester ESL course, which may or may not count toward graduation. Upon its completion, international and domestic multilingual students may find themselves taking other courses that pay little attention to their specific needs or unique perspectives. One way of addressing this shortcoming is to have a designated unit on campus that can provide ongoing, multifaceted language and culture support. In Chapter 3, McMartin-Miller chronicles the development of the International Tutoring Center (ITC) at Northeastern University, which offers individual, group, and online tutorials that address a range of skills and needs, from career preparation to casual conversation. The chapter ends with a discussion of how the COVID-19 pandemic created a need to move all tutorials online, and how the ITC has adapted accordingly. In fact, advancements in digital technologies present a range of possibilities for offering support beyond traditional classroom settings. In Chapter 4, Bush, Allen, Farner, and Pimenova present an innovative approach to designing virtual learning spaces within an undergraduate EAP course at Purdue University that has helped students work toward IaH outcomes while meeting the course objectives. The authors show how the use of video blogs and digital storytelling invites students to express and develop their intercultural identities in ways that “change our students’

understanding of themselves and others, but that they can change others' preconceived notions and expectations about what it means to be an international student" (p.x).

The final two chapters in Section 1 describe partner programs that are embedded in English language courses at two different universities. In Chapter 5, Rodríguez-Fuentes, Corrales, Paba, and Rosado discuss the implementation of virtual exchanges (VEs) between students at Universidad del Norte in Colombia and peers at a U.S. university, which allow for IaH to occur in a higher education setting that has few international students. These "web-based pen pals" create authentic opportunities for students to practice the language skills they have learned in class and to improve their intercultural competence. VEs also appear to be well suited for situations like a global pandemic where students are unable to travel abroad and must take classes online. In Chapter 6, Cheng provides the historical institutional context for internationalization efforts at Purdue University to show how a program that connects undergraduate domestic students with international teaching assistants (ITA's) is meaningful for this context and beneficial for both student populations; the ITA partner program facilitates the sociocultural integration of international students into the university while equipping domestic students with international skills and knowledge.

The authors included in Section 2 explore issues of L2 writing and cross-cultural composition in undergraduate and graduate programs at institutions large and small. Since most colleges and universities in North America require all students to take introductory composition classes, writing programs are an important site for addressing both the theoretical and practical issues of IaH through their work on language use and knowledge sharing. In Chapter 7, Saenkhum and Soblo provide an overview of the assessment and placement options that the composition program at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville have considered in response to

the rapid internationalization of its undergraduate population. The authors explain why and how program administrators implemented cross-cultural composition as a means of promoting interaction among L1 and L2 English-speaking students and of providing opportunities for all students to develop their intercultural communication skills through participation and collaboration in a multicultural, multilingual classroom environment.

In Chapter 8, Ene and Cohen present the case of a multicultural composition course at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) that aligns with the campus's strategic goal of internationalizing its student body, curriculum, and co-curriculum by serving both L1 and L2 speakers of English. In addition to presenting survey and reflection-based data, the authors describe how the syllabus and materials evolved over the course of three semesters. In Chapter 9, Gherwash explains how internationalization efforts at Colby College, a small liberal arts college in the U.S., have been implemented in the cross-cultural design of a first-year composition course. After describing the structure and content of the course, the author addresses the particular challenges of internationalization at smaller colleges, where faculty expertise and institutional resources can be much more limited than at large universities.

In Chapter 10, Moussu and Sgaramella introduce a non-traditional model to support L2 graduate students called the "Guided Writing Instruction Group" (GWIG), which aims to facilitate the learning of academic writing conventions among L2 graduate students and to respond to their frequent requests for help, along with requests from their supervisors and departments. Additionally, GWIGs help to boost students' self-confidence and improve their communicative skills so that they can become active members of their chosen discourse communities. Taken together, the chapters in this section provide educators and administrators

with innovative ways to use internationalization as a lens to revitalize existing composition classes and programs, or to create new ones.

In the afterword, Deardorff reflects on the contributions of this volume to the larger body of research on internationalization in higher education. [COMPLETE PARAGRAPH FORTHCOMING].

We hope that language educators and program administrators who read this volume will benefit from seeing their own work framed within these discussions of IoHE/IaH while encountering new perspectives and insights about the local work involved in such efforts. We also hope that this volume will appeal to other stakeholders—particularly faculty, staff, and administrators who work with international student populations—and that they too will benefit by gaining a better understanding of how language and cultural issues are — sometimes unexpectedly—a vital aspect of internationalization efforts on any campus.

References

- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2009). *Intercultural knowledge and effectiveness VALUE rubric*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/intercultural-knowledge>
- Berardo, K., & Deardorff, D. K. (2012). *Building cultural competence: Innovative activities and models*. Stylus.
- Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015). Redefining internationalization at home. In A. Curaj, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi, & P. Scott (Eds.), *The European higher education area: Between critical reflections and future policies* (pp. 59–72). SpringerOpen.

- Benzie, H. J. (2010). Graduating as a 'native speaker': International students and English language proficiency in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(4), 447–459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294361003598824>
- Bond, B. (2020). *Making language visible in the university: English for academic purposes and internationalisation*. Multilingual Matters.
- Castro, P., Woodin, J., Lundgren, U., & Byram, M. (2016). Student mobility and internationalisation in higher education: Perspectives from practitioners. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16(3), 418–436. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2016.1168052>
- Charles, H., & Deardorff, D. K. (2014, June 18). A failure to capitalize on globalization [WorldWise]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com/blogs/worldwise/a-failure-to-capitalize-on-globalization/339>
- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241–266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287002>
- Deardorff, D. K. (2015). *Demystifying outcomes assessment for international educators: A practical approach*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (2007). Study abroad as foreign language practice. In R. M. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (pp. 208–226). Cambridge University Press.
- de Wit, H. & Jones, E. (2014, November 14). We need to change the language of internationalisation. *University World News*, 343. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20141112125546605>

- de Wit, H., & Hunter, F. (2015). The future of internationalization of higher education in Europe. *International Higher Education*, 83, 2-3. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2015.83.9073>
- Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2012). Beyond immersion: The American University Center of Provence experiment in holistic intervention. In M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, & K. H. Lou (Eds.), *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it* (pp. 284–307). Stylus Sterling, VA.
- Eurostat. (2019). Education and training in the EU: Facts and figures. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Education_and_training_in_the_EU_-_facts_and_figures
- Galante, A. (2014). Developing EAL learners' intercultural sensitivity through a digital literacy project. *TESL Canada Journal*, 32(1), 53. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v32i1.1199>
- Hammer, M. R. (2012). The intercultural development inventory: A new frontier in assessment and development of intercultural competence. In M. Vande Berg, R. M. Paige, & K. H. Lou (Eds.), *Student Learning Abroad* (Vol. 5, pp. 115–136). Stylus.
- Horner, B., Lu, M.-Z., & Matsuda, P.K. (Eds.). (2010). *Cross-language relations in composition*. Southern Illinois UP.
- Hudzik, J. K. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization*. Washington, D.C.: NAFSA, The Association of International Educators.
- Institute of International Education (2019). Enrollment Trends. *Open Doors*. Retrieved from <https://opendoorsdata.org/data/international-students/enrollment-trends/>
- Jackson, J. (2014). *Introducing language and intercultural communication*. London: Routledge.

- Jackson, J. (2018). Intervening in the intercultural learning of L2 study abroad students: From research to practice. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 365–382.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000392>
- Jones, E. (2013) Internationalization and employability: The role of intercultural experiences in the development of transferable skills. *Public Money and Management*, 33 (2), 95–104.
- Jordan, J. (2012). *Redesigning composition for multilingual realities*. CCC and NCTE.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2-3.
- Landorf, H., Doscher, S., & Hardrick, J. (2018). *Making Global Learning Universal: Promoting Inclusion and Success for All Students*. Stylus.
- Rhodes, T. (2010). *Assessing outcomes and improving achievement: Tips and tools for using rubrics*. Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Sherry, M., Thomas, P., & Chui, W. H. (2010). International students: A vulnerable student population. *Higher Education*, 60(1), 33–46.
- Siczek, M., & Shapiro, S. (2014). Developing writing-intensive courses for a globalized curriculum through WAC-TESOL collaborations. In T.M. Zawacki & M. Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 329-346). *Perspectives on Writing*. Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.
- Vande Berg, M., Paige, R. M., & Lou, K. H. (2012). *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it*. Stylus.

Weiser, I., & Rose, S. K. (2018). Internationalized writing programs in the twenty-first-century United States: Implications and opportunities. In S. K. Rose & I. Weiser (Eds.), *The internationalization of U.S. writing programs* (pp.1-10). Utah State University Press.

Zawacki, T. M., & Cox, M. (Eds.). (2014). *WAC and second-language writers: Research Towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices*. Perspectives on Writing. The WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press.

<https://wac.colostate.edu/books/perspectives/12/>