Higher Education Internationalization and Internationalization-at-Home

The globalized economy and increased mobility of people around the world, particularly in the last 30 years, has led to the internationalization of higher education (de Wit & Hunter, 2015, p.2). One of the commodities that people are willing to pursue by becoming globally mobile is an education which may give them access to better opportunities, and usually this is tied to learning English (Weiser & Rose, 2018, p.4). Today, most higher education institutions have a strategic approach to internationalization, though only some have the financial resources to implement it (Marinoni & de Wit, 2019, p. 12). Evidently, there is a financial incentive in internationalizing by attracting international students who usually pay higher tuition rates. However, in recent years, the emphasis has shifted towards internationalization-at-home. This can be achieved in various ways, including increased engagement between domestic and international students in internationalized curricula with global learning goals (often articulated at institutional level). Internationalization-at-home helps offset the inequities inherent to internationalizing only through costly study abroad; it also promotes deeper cultural understanding among domestic and international students, for the benefit of all. As such, true internationalization, 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).

Curriculum Internationalization and Writing Courses

Little has been written about internationalization-at-home and writing curricula or programs. We argue that first-year writing (FYW), as a core experience for most students in North American higher education, is prime for internationalization and will allow students to explore global mindedness early. An internationalized writing course or curriculum will support the open-mindedness and critical thinking skills necessary across the disciplines and into the students' future careers. As writing spans the curriculum and disciplines, internationalizing the writing curriculum keeps students connected to global learning throughout their education.

In their collection *The Internationalization of U.S. Writing Programs,* Weiser and Rose (2018) noted that writing faculty and program administrators "see the new reality of a much more linguistically, culturally, ethnically, geographically diverse student population as a challenging opportunity to review and revise their curriculum and pedagogy, the professional-development opportunities provided to their faculty, and their campus-wide collaborations" (p.7). Internationalized writing courses and programs constitute opportunities for faculty to do important cultural work, because "when international and domestic students are enrolled in the same courses, the kind of exposure to language and cultural differences that is an oft-stated reason for internationalizing our campuses benefits both groups of students" (p.8).

From Cross-cultural/Multicultural Writing to Translingual and Internationalized Writing

If and how international and domestic, or non-native and native English-speaking students can learn successfully together in FYW college courses is an enduring question. In the 1990s, voices from the new field of second language writing were concerned that mainstreaming international non-native English-speaking students in FYW was pedagogically unsound. Mainstreaming was economically feasible, as it did not obligate programs to create special sections for a student population, to hire or train English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers,

or to readjust the curriculum (Silva, 1994, p.39). The rationale was that ESL students —

including international, immigrants, and bilingual students—must function in mainstream

academic courses, and therefore writing programs should not treat them as a special group.

Mainstreaming was a "sink or swim option" (Silva, 1994, p. 38), because ESL students had to

adapt quickly to U.S. academic writing requirements, often at the cost of (part of) their cultural

identity, or fail under the stress. In conjunction with the argument that the needs of basic and

ESL writers have different underlying causes, the criticism against mainstreaming helped build

the case for ESL writing courses, in which ESL students felt more comfortable (Liu, 2001), and

which seemed to lead to a better passing rate than mainstreaming (Braine, 1996). Since this

option raised "the specter of segregation" (Silva, 1994, p.40), the quest for better solutions

continued.

Cross-cultural writing courses, also originally known as multicultural or mixed

composition, were advocated for as an option that draws on both native and non-native English-

speakers' strengths and segregates neither (Matsuda, 2010; Matsuda & Silva, 2011). Silva (1994)

saw cross-cultural writing courses as intended to "meet the instructional needs of both groups

and, as a dividend, to foster cross cultural understanding, communication, and collaboration"

(p.40). Cross-cultural writing courses are also distinguished by readings, assignments, and

activities that are deliberately selected to bring to the forefront issues and perspectives from the

students' own cultures and languages. By also working with a predetermined mix of native and

non-native English-speakers, cross-cultural writing courses were seen as distinct from both ESL

and mainstream writing classes.

Research has failed to solidify a distinct place for cross-cultural writing with these

specifications, possibly because institutions either did not have the ability to implement them or

they did not see them as different from what they were usually doing. In a study conducted by Ene and Liu (2003; also Ene & Burrup, 2001) at the University of Arizona, which implemented the cross-cultural composition model suggested by Silva (1994), the authors found that both students and teachers had positive perceptions of the course, and – despite initial reservations about interacting and peer-reviewing – all students ended up appreciating these processes as enjoyable and culturally enlightening. The three teachers agreed on the importance of knowing how to address the linguistic needs of the ESL writers in addition to navigating cultural diversity and developing intercultural competence for both the domestic and the international students. More recent research, published under the umbrella of internationalization, continues to support the idea that multilingual writing courses for international students taught by ESL experts are the optimal option, although student agency in placement is also being advocated (Shuck & Wilber, 2018).

Proponents of translingualism (Canagarajah, 2016) have emphasized that students contribute diverse multicultural dimensions to their learning environments, and it would be to all students' benefit to explore their own linguistic backgrounds, use their languages, and share their multicultural wealth with peers. In the translingual view, difference and diversity are a resource rather than a deficit. Canagarajah's (2016) recommendation that writing teachers adopt a translingual approach implies that writing teachers should value and implement teaching strategies that capitalize on "students' resources, including multiple languages and language varieties" (Mina & Cimasko, 2020, p.76). In the literature predating translingualism, cross-cultural writing courses were described similarly. Additionally, Matsuda and Silva (2011) had also recommended that cross-cultural writing teachers should be trained in teaching both writing

and ESL to address the language needs specific to ESL learners with methods based in solid knowledge about second language acquisition.

An important point of contact between the above theoretically grounded proposals from second language writing studies or translingualism, and studies on internationalization is the argument presented by Andrade (2006) that interaction between domestic and international students promotes improved cultural understanding for both populations (as cited in Mina and Cimasko, 2020). As Mina and Cimasko (2020) noted, international students on U.S. campuses make meaningful friendships with co-nationals, and only in their absence with American students, who come across as uninterested in international students. Consequently, the authors suggest that increased interaction between domestic and international students in writing courses provides precious opportunities.

Internationalized writing courses can look different from one another but are motivated by the sense that writing courses need to prepare students for transnational literacy realities. Martins and Van Horn (2018) started from this assumption and showed how an FYW and an EAP director developed internationalized writing courses by building on both of their strengths as teachers and scholars. Martins's use of literacy narrative/autoethnographic analysis assignments complemented Van Horn's familiarity with intercultural learning, resulting in an internationalized writing course with new learning outcomes focused on students understanding language as a resource and a shaping factor (p.153). After analyzing themes from their students Writing Literacy Project and the instructors' journals, Martins and Van Horn's concluded:

> We believe internationalizing FYW must extend beyond business as usual focused on topics like World Englishes, the global digital divide, and identity. Our experiences have us focused on (1) designing opportunities for students to interact in socially diverse

activities and reflect deeply in writing on their communication experiences and (2) identifying key concepts instructors and students can use to make sense of the complex communication experiences in those contexts. The kinds of opportunities we have in mind include collaborative, conversational experiences with peers of different linguistic backgrounds and exploring situations that are culturally mixed or have some form of hybridity. (2018, p.164)

Purpose of the Study

Our purpose is to probe the claims made since the early arguments in favor of cross-cultural/multicultural writing until the current days of translingualism, transnationalism, and internationalization. Specifically, we wanted to explore the cultural, linguistic, and writing-related transformations undergone by the students in a course made up of international and domestic native and non-native speakers of English, which focuses on global topics and emphasizes their exploration from global perspectives by engaging the students in multi-draft, peer-reviewed writing under the guidance of a teacher trained in writing and ESL. Hereafter, we will refer to the course we co-designed and Cohen taught as internationalized writing, in keeping with the focus of this volume. We will refer to our students as English for Academic Purposes (EAP) students and Writing Program (WP) students, based on their enrollment path into the course, explained below.

Context

IUPUI is a public, urban university in the Midwest region of the U.S., attended by about 20,000 students, of which about 10% are international students, primarily from China, India, and Saudi Arabia. IUPUI has designated internationalization as a strategic goal in a couple of iterations of its strategic plan since 2007 ("Strategic Planning," 2020). In addition to pursuing

international partners, increased participation in study abroad, and increased international student recruitment, the university has been pursuing internationalization-at-home. The institution has a director of curriculum internationalization in the Office of International Affairs and has formalized dimensions of global learning for developing global learning mindsets for all students ("IUPUI Dimensions," 2020).

As an applied linguist and director of the EAP Program, Ene teaches and designs curriculum for the international students on campus. She also provides professional development for pre-service and in-service teachers of international students, in her role as TESOL faculty and supervisor in EAP. She leads a campus-level community of practice on intercultural learning for faculty. Ene routinely teaches EAP writing courses and focuses her research on second language writing. She experienced an early version of cross-cultural composition at the University of Arizona, where she collected data to document the its effectiveness. At IUPUI, she presented the idea of adopting the cross-cultural composition model to colleagues over time. Cohen has been a writing instructor in the WP for 27 years and off and on for the EAP Program for 10 years. She has taught FYW, professional writing, and writing for publication. She was also involved in the above-mentioned community of practice on intercultural learning.

The EAP curriculum includes a basic writing course and a credit-bearing FYW course (G131) for EAP students equivalent to the FYW required course offered by the WP (W131). International students who test out of EAP courses based on the EAP placement test can opt to take G131 or W131. Domestic multilingual students usually enroll in WP courses; some choose EAP courses. EAP students who receive the highest score on the essay placement test can choose W131 or G131. They can advance into higher-level WP classes after completing their EAP requirements. In brief, the WP has always had some international and domestic non-native

English-speaking students, but not necessarily a systematic approach to teaching them. A couple of instructors would shuttle between the programs, and a few would capitalize on their own scholarly interests in translingualism or World Englishes.

W131: Reading, Writing, and Inquiry is described as a course that "builds students' abilities to read written and cultural texts critically; to analyze those texts in ways that engage both students' own experiences and the perspectives of others; and to write about those texts for a range of audiences and purposes as a means of participating in broader conversations" ("W131: Reading," 2018, para. 2). Assignments require students to analyze and synthesize sources to develop thesis-driven essays. Writing as a process is emphasized; peer reviews and retrospectives are integral components of the class. Students produce 3-4 essays throughout the semester and select which they would like to submit in a portfolio.

EAP's G131 is W131 adapted for EAP. G131 has the same learning goals, multi-draft-process-oriented approach to writing, and major assignments. Instructors provide copious feedback on student papers, conduct writing conferences, and embed intercultural rhetoric and grammar instruction in the course. They do not have to adhere to a theme the entire semester, but they always work with articles which can be analyzed from different cultural perspectives and have global significance (for example: the environment, the internet and freedom, human rights, etc.). The EAP curriculum is recognized in the university system as doing significant work to develop cultural understanding and intercultural competence: EAP courses receive cultural understanding credit and "I" credit for internationalized courses. G131 does not carry this credit because it is part of the general education core, but EAP instructors approach the class with the purpose to enhance cultural understanding.

Our Internationalized Writing Course

In fall 2016, we created a FYW course for EAP and WP students. The experience was repeated in fall 2018 and 2019. The class and study design was based on Ene's previous experience teaching and researching multicultural composition, combined with her current interest in internationalization. The following are distinctive features we implemented:

- **Scheduling/advising:** A note in the schedule of classes informed students and advisors that W131/G131 was a combined section.

- **Enrollment:** The course was set up so that more than half of the students (up to two thirds) would be EAP students, based on concerns that the EAP students would be intimidated if out-numbered (Liu, 2001).

- **Autobiographical Narrative Assignment:** The first paper assigned to the students was an Autobiographical Narrative. Although the use of the Autobiographical Narrative is available to FYW instructors at IUPUI, thesis-driven assignments are favored. In a multicultural class, the use of personal narrative reflects the rationale that using our own lives as curriculum adds relevance to the writing process and serves as a portal into deep and authentic critical thinking (Pierson, 2014; Weinstein, 2006). Personal narratives "could prompt students from dominant positionalities to reexamine how their worldviews are formed, and how such views impact others relationally, politically, and emotionally" (Yam, 2018, p. 11). We find similarities with Martins and Van Horn's (2018) use of a Writing Literacy Project in an internationalized writing course. In the Autobiographical Narrative, an assignment developed from *The Allyn & Bacon Guide to Writing,* our students were asked to narrate experiences of (1) overcoming an obstacle with language or literacy, or (2) educating someone about their culture. Students were to tell a story "through the use of contraries, creating tension that moves the story forward and gives it

significance" (Ramage, Bean, & Johnson, 2006, p.169). They then explained how the experience was revealing or conveyed meaning or insight (Ramage et al., 2006). The assignment was meant to help the students build a sense of community with their classmates during the brainstorming discussions that led up to selecting a focus for their narrative, as well as subsequent peer reviews. It was meant to help students develop confidence about the relevance of their experiences and provide the opportunity to present their unique perspectives as a foundation for future thesis-driven essays. The goal was to begin fostering opportunities for all students to be exposed to and mutually respect differing culturally-based perspectives.

- **Topics and student agency:** By design, course topics were based on socio-political, globally relevant concerns of the time (for example: elections, the Olympic spirit, assisted suicide, the legalization of marijuana, same-sex marriage, compulsory military service, nuclear energy, immigration). While the majority FYW courses at IUPUI are asked to base their essays around a non-fiction book or a series of thematic essays, our class allowed students to select their own topics from a list of topics in Gale's Opposing Viewpoints database.

- **Other assignments:** The other course assignments were a Summary Response in which the students had to respond from a personal perspective to a single source on a topic; and a Synthesis paper in which the analysis had to include several sources in addition to the personal response (contextualizing the personal response in a research-based argument). We sequenced the assignments to help students gain confidence expressing their personal perspectives while using their voice to respond to different viewpoints.

- **Portfolios:** The Midterm Portfolio required students to select one of the two essays they developed during the first half of the semester and develop a retrospective that explained how they were working to achieve the course goals. The Final Portfolio contained a retrospective and two essays, but one of the essays had to be written during the second half of the semester. Students also submitted peer reviews and statements analyzing how they revised their work.

- **Classroom activities:** For the thesis-driven essays, the students engaged in oral debates. The class was divided into two groups, and students took turns being the spokesperson for their group. The spokesperson collaborated with group members to develop arguments for the side of the issue they were given, whether or not they agreed with it. The arguments developed by the groups provided the basis for their thesis-driven essays. Through these discussions, students became aware of perspectives they otherwise would not have been exposed to, and they participated in activities that allowed them to take and defend different perspectives other than their own.

- **Writing process:** In our internationalized course, students were required to take an additional step to peer reviews by completing a peer review response. Students were asked to (1) provide feedback to a peer based on a guideline provided to them in class, (2) indicate what decisions they wanted to make to their final drafts as a result of that feedback, (3) show specifically where and how changes were made, and (4) indicate where/how their writing and thinking were changed as a result of the cultural knowledge they gained from both giving and receiving peer reviews. Parts (2), (3), and (4) are responses to the feedback received and will be referred to as peer review responses hereafter.

Research Design

Thirty-one EAP and 31 WP students enrolled in our internationalized writing course in three fall semesters in 2016 (10 EAP and 12 WP students), 2018 (11 EAP and 10 WP students), and 2019 (10 EAP and 9 WP). The EAP students were all international, non-native speakers of English, and most of the WP students were U.S. domestic, native speakers of English, though a few were domestic multilingual (Generation 1.5) writers. Although the courses were capped in the schedule so that two thirds of the class would be made up of EAP students for the reasons explained above, during the enrollment period student scheduling conflicts did not permit adherence to this plan. We ended up with a balanced make-up of the classes. The EAP students came from India, Malaysia, Vietnam, Myanmar, Brazil, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Israel, and Venezuela. The majority (65%, or 20), EAP survey respondents reported they had been in the U.S. and at the university for less than a year, but they had studied English in their home countries for more than 10 years before coming to the U.S.

We used peer review responses, the retrospectives included in the student portfolio, and an end-of-semester survey to gather student perceptions about their achievement of the course goals and how their perspectives and/or writing might have shifted. The survey yielded quantitative results. We performed a qualitative analysis of the students' comments in the peer review responses, as well as the retrospectives.

The course offered in 2016 served as a pilot. We collected end-of-semester surveys and final portfolio retrospectives that semester. During the course, the instructor noticed that peer reviews focused on predominantly on obvious language and organization issues, but the regular peer reviews were not bringing out the multicultural wealth of the course. The authors convened

and decided to add questions to the peer review response form in 2017 and 2018 in order to orient the students more towards content and the multicultural dimensions of the class.

Findings

Themes from Peer Review Responses

The new question in the peer review responses in 2018 and 2019 was "What cultural knowledge did you gain from the assignment or peer review?" The peer review responses for the assignments completed earlier in the semester, namely the Autobiographical Narrative and the Summary Response, were more productive with regard to this question. Once the students began working on the Synthesis Essay and Final Portfolio, they stopped answering the added question.

Peer review responses on the Autobiographical Narrative. In the two semesters, 30 students completed the peer review response for the Autobiographical Narrative. Of these, 10 EAP (33%) and 13 WP (43%) students addressed the culture question. The students worked in various pairs with peers from both groups, sometimes conducting more than one peer review: 8 EAP students peer reviewed the work of WP students, 8 WP students reviewed EAP student papers (in different pairs), 2 EAP students reviewed the paper of other EAP students, and 5 WP students reviewed other WP students. We were pleased that the students voluntarily interacted across groups more than within.

We devided the 23 answers into parts, or comments, based on topics they referred two, then grouping the topics into themes. The 23 answers yielded 28 comments about three main themes: cultural understanding, language, and writing norms.

Table 1

Areas in which the Students in the Internationalized Course Developed

	Cultural Understanding	Language	Writing Norms	

Student Group	Number of comments	Percentage from total number of comments (27)	Number of comments	Percentage from total number of comments (27)	Number of comments	Percentage from total number of comments (27)	Total number of comments
EAP	7	25%	2	7.1%	3	10.7%	12
WP	11	39.2%	4	14.2%	1	3.6%	16
EAP+WP	18	64.2%	6	21.4%	4	14.2%	28

Most of the comments (64.2%) referred to the students developing their cultural understanding by learning something new or by expanding their thinking as a result of becoming aware of a different perspective. The answers referred to learning about the values, norms, and practices of other societies, as well as better understanding the relationship between culture and identity. Students had the opportunity to expand their thinking by empathizing with another peer; for example, EAP student AM took on the challenge to imagine how it would be to not speak one's own mother tongue fluently after interacting with a multilingual WP student. WP students also reflected on the role of place, religion, race, social norms, and personality in defining one's identity and sense of belonging. For example:

- KI's paper made me realize how different the place she is from is. Even though she was from there, she was still nervous that they wouldn't be accepting of her. (LA, WP, 2018)

- Writing this paper helped remind me of how the smallest morals of a different culture can make one feel so unwelcome. It makes me wonder if Americans do anything that makes people with different ethnic backgrounds feel unwelcome ... (JO, WP, 2018)

- I learned that culture doesn't have to be a way of religion or race, but where you come from. I come from a small town, my culture involves me knowing everyone and feeling out of place when in a room full of strangers. TY's culture is his love for sports ... (JE, WP, 2019)

In the language-related answers (21.4% of the total), an EAP student "remembered that English is not everyone's first language," and a WP transcended to a higher level of understanding about the impact of accents:

- I used to think that my accent held me back from fully communicating my ideas. But, sometimes, no matter how good you are a language, you still won't be able to express yourself because of situation. I found out that there are other ways in which people feel held back or subdued. (CH, WP, 2018)

Some students gained awareness of how writing norms differ across languages and cultures:

- The structuring of paragraphs and language styles are different from what I learnt in my system of education, which was mainly British based. (AM, EAP, 2018)

Peer review responses on the Summary Response. For the peer review response related to the Summary Response assignment, 18 (55%) students (11 EAP and 7 WP) of 33 who completed the peer review addressed the question about cultural knowledge gained.

The students' answers were more focused and detailed but less thematically varied than in the peer review response for the Autobiographical Narrative. We obtained 18 mono-thematic answers from 18 students. As in the case of the Autobiographical Narrative, the dominant theme had to do with developing cultural understanding. Ten students'(55%) reported specific factual knowledge gained or a change in point of view that the student experienced after being exposed to arguments from another cultural perspective. For example:

- Different people of different cultures handle these issues differently; my peer wrote a paper on euthanasia which is a heavily debated topic here but back in my home country I don't recall people discussing about this at all. (AM, EAP, 2018)

- I read through a paper that I may not have completely agreed with, but I saw their side of it. (LI, WP, 2018)

Answers about writing norms were the second most frequent (8, or 44%), and 6 of them were by EAP students who reflected on learning how to write persuasively by U.S. academic norms or become aware of different writing styles. VI, an EAP student, reflected:

- I learned about the faults in structure and gained an insight on how persuasive I was being. I also learned about the mistakes in syntax and mentioning things that I hadn't before helping me to shape my essay in being more convincing. (2019)

A couple of WP students' eyes also opened to the fact that writing strategies differ across cultures as in the following example: "I've learned that some people have a different writing style than my own" (KI, WP, 2018).

Themes from the Retrospective Essays

In the retrospective essays submitted with the Final Portfolio, students were asked to reflect on their achievement of the course goals. The students were encouraged, though not required, to reflect on how they and their writing had been influenced in the internationalized course. Of the 58 students who completed the retrospective, 31 (53%) of them – 18 EAP and 13 WP students – offered comments related to this. The students related growing as writers, both in skill and in confidence, and as individuals, to being pushed to think from different perspectives. Here is how an EAP student reflected on his increased confidence as a writer at the end of the class, also alluding to the relationship between this and the opportunity to exchange ideas with international and domestic peers:

- As a non-native English speaker, English W131/G131 is the most important class for me. It is not only where I learn to develop my writing skills but also where I

communicate my ideas about different topics with international students as well as native English speakers... I had doubts about my ability to develop this skill and therefore I had been feeling unconfident with my writing until I took this class. The fact that this class has both non-native and native English speakers made me feel less nervous about my writing because I know that we are all here to learn English and it is acceptable to make mistakes as long as we learn from them. … It has been a pleasure being in a class that has both native English speakers as well as non-native English speakers as it gave me a sense of belonging and it helped me feel less anxious around native English speakers. (MA, EAP, 2016)

From the EAP students' retrospectives, we extracted 22 paragraphs in which they reported gaining cultural understanding. We found 12 such paragraphs in the WP students' essays. Some representative excerpts quoted below highlight that the class helped both EAP and WP students learn about other cultures, their own and others' ways of thinking or expressing themselves, open-mindedness, and communication in a multicultural environment.

- I thoroughly enjoyed explaining the Indian culture and festivals to my peers while also understanding the American celebrations like Thanksgiving. I was amazed to see the inquisitiveness of my peers at understanding how other cultures work, and in meeting new people. I definitely enjoyed being in the combined class. (VA, EAP, 2016)
- Being in a mixed class allowed us to discuss the different views that each student's background impacted in the perspective of a certain topic, enabling us to

accept and understand diverse viewpoints, making us better prepared to deal with differences. (YA, EAP, 2016)

- I accepted different point of views with a much more open heart … Coming from a country 14,000 km away (8,700 miles for the Americans out there) on a 32 hour flight to a whole new continent that I have never been before, this class feels like home to me as most of us are totally new coming to this country and we can have an open conversation about our cultural differences, challenges and experiences... This class helps me express myself in ways I have never thought I could express myself in this multicultural setting. (SI, EAP, 2018)

- Having a culturally diverse environment has helped in my ENG-W131 class, because it lets you see and experience how other cultures live and how they demonstrate it throughout their writing. After revising a non-native speakers' paper, I see where some struggle in the English language where maybe native people do not... Peer reviewing a non-native speakers' writing has helped me not only learn about them but learn about their culture as a whole. (LI, WP, 2018)

- I wasn't aware going into this semester that I was in a multicultural class, but I think it has been very beneficial for me. Since I come from a very small town, we do not have a diverse community. I enjoyed getting to know some of the people in my class and seeing how they liked taking our English class even though it is not their first language. It gave me a new appreciation for what we learn here just by seeing how much they enjoyed it. I now can write a paper with more of an open mind about the different people who may be reading my paper. (LA, WP, 2018)

Students reflected on how the course affected their language learning or their perception and knowledge of language and writing conventions. In the EAP students' essays, we found 14 such comments, and in the WP students' there were 13, as in the following example:

- Peer review and interaction with my peers exposed me to several small yet significant writing practices or rules such as indenting paragraphs, avoiding run ons, citations, double spacing and others. Most of my peers have also been very encouraging and supportive of my work... This class was definitely one of the best and most conducive environments for growth... Taking the writing course with both native and non-native English speakers was a good blend of cultural diversity and served as a great way of overcoming the hesitation I had when approaching native English speakers. This class also assured me that a non-native English speaker can become equally competent in the English language although it may be their second language. (VA, EAP, 2016)

- The professor took a brilliant step this time by having a class that has both native English speakers and non-native English speakers in it. For me it was a good learning experience as I got to know how the native speakers think and generate ideas. Also, I used to assume that native English speakers are better writers that non-native ones but that is not always true i.e. it's the ideas that matter and not the writer's linguistic proficiency. Therefore, I hope they have more such classes in the university. Overall, it was a fun learning to write effectively with passion and freedom. (RA, EAP, 2016)

- The combination of non-native English speakers and native English speakers has allowed for a more culturally educated environment. Peer reviews saw much more

technical corrections in grammar and phrasing. It also gave me the opportunity to see different ideas on structuring an essay as well as unique phrasings. (KA, WP, 2018)

- Lastly, taking an English class that had both non-native speakers and native speakers had a huge impact with my writing. I learned more writing styles from different cultures. (CA, WP, 2016)

- I excel in grammar I lack talent in writing skills, especially at the beginning of the semester. Now even though these students did not have perfect grammar, they were much better writers than I was so having read over my essay and give me pointers was exceptionally helpful. (GA, WP, 2016)

- I ... got to make new friends and learn about new cultures. The class had an impact on my writing because I got to help the NNES become more accustomed with the English language and writing... which also caused me to reflect back on my writing and see if I had made the same errors. (ER, WP, 2016)

End-of-Semester Surveys

The 24 EAP students – 77% of the total – who completed the end-of-the-semester survey were from nine different countries: India (11), Malaysia (5), Vietnam (2), Myanmar (1), Brazil (1), Nigeria (1), Saudi Arabia (1), Israel (1), and Venezuela (1). Twenty-five WP students completed the survey.

The multicultural, internationalized nature of the course was missed by most upon enrolling. Fifteen (61%) of the 24 EAP respondents enrolled in the course by chance; twelve (48%) of the respondents indicated that the class had fit their schedule. The WP students had the same main reasons for enrolling in the class: chance 19 (76%) and timing 12 (48%).

The course was a success in the judgement of both EAP and WP students. Twenty (83%) of the EAP students felt that their writing significantly improved in the course. Twenty-three (92%) of the WP students thought that they improved or significantly improved, but most of them reported improving some rather than improving significantly, unlike the EAP students. Most of the EAP respondents – 22 (96%) – would recommend an internationalized writing course to others. For 20 (94%) of them, the main element that made the course effective was the teacher. Fewer (11, or 61%) of the WP students said they would recommend the course, and 22 (or 88%) thought that the course instructor made it effective.

When asked how the internationalized writing course was better than other writing courses taken in the past, the few (9, or 39%) EAP students who had a term of comparison named several reasons, including that the class gave them a chance to learn about different cultures (2), that it was interactive (2) and challenging (2), and because it was not literature-based (1). Two WP students thought the class was better thanks to its diversity.

The course supported cultural development. Fewer than half of the students answered the cultural development question, but from these slightly more than half of the EAP respondents (12, or 52%) thought they significantly improved or improved their cultural understanding and attributed this development to interacting with students from other backgrounds in the class, having to understand their perspectives, and reading their papers. Eleven (44%) of the WP respondents also indicated that their knowledge of other cultures improved or significantly improved.

The EAP and the WP students reported similar strengths and challenges as writers; some of these were slightly more pronounced in the EAP group. Most of both EAP and WP students indicated seldom or never having difficulty with the writing process, engaging in discussion, or

communicating with the teacher. About half of the EAP students indicated still having a difficult time incorporating sources, and about a quarter of them reported difficulties with organization, thesis writing, and grammar. About one third of the WP students reported the same difficulties, including challenges with grammatical accuracy. Almost all the students found the class activities useful or very useful.

Discussion

Our findings reveal our students' perception that the internationalized writing course was a success. Many students drew direct connections between their satisfaction with the course and the fact it was internationalized in terms of diverse student population and approach. In the semesters when we probed the students' impression of their learning before mid-term – meaning in the 2018 and the 2019 peer review responses - we learned that the students were already aware of the effects of the course well before having an opportunity to reflect on it extensively in their Final Portfolio Retrospective. As is fairly typical, the students were not initially attracted to the course because it was multicultural or internationalized, but – given the opportunity – they began valuing it (Ene & Liu, 2003; Shuck & Wilber, 2018). We can only speculate that a higher baseline level of readiness for an internationalized experience may lead to even higher levels of achievement in cultural understanding and writing. It is important for programs and institutions to ensure that ample opportunities exist in the curriculum for students to have internationalized learning experiences, because they appreciate them once exposed.

As far as the distinctive features of the internationalized course – the Autobiographical Narrative; the customized peer review responses and retrospective essays designed to trigger reflections on the benefits of being in a multicultural, internationalized writing course; the topic selection and student agency – our findings show that such features indeed highlight the

internationalized experience. As hypothesized, the Autobiographical Narrative laid the ground for building community and connecting the students to their own and others' perspectives, providing a portal into deeper exploration and more comfortable cross-cultural interactions throughout the course. The revised peer review responses and retrospectives provided opportunities to reflect, as well as evidence of the course's success. Reflection as a tool for active learning is paramount to gaining a higher level of awareness about what is being learned (Williams, Woolliams, & Spiro, 2012). Therefore, we encourage instructors and administrators to build such features into their internationalized courses, and require reflective elements. When we designed the course, we prioritized student agency. However, we are finding that increased cultural awareness does not happen unprompted, and students may benefit more from having their attention channeled in specific directions. Martins & Van Horn (2018) also suggested shifting "the focus of peer review away from process" in order to allow students to establish more "meaningful exchanges" (p. 165). Future research would benefit from determining the merits of incorporating even more, required cultural reflections and contrastive analyses of texts. Ultimately, we are of the same mind with Martins and Van Horn (2018) that creating overarching goals for internationalized writing courses would better "... highlight the social and cultural processes in writing" and reflect student awareness of how "social, linguistic, cultural, and national" influences" have shaped their thinking and writing (p. 152). For a writing course, this would mean including goals that require students

- to respond to readings that have an international/global focus;

- to define and reflect on their own culture(s);

- to analyze and reflect on the connections between culture and perspectives, including their own;

- to reflect on language varieties and audience considerations.

It has been argued since the earliest contemplations of cross-cultural/multicultural composition (Silva, 1994; Matsuda & Silva, 2011) that a teacher trained in teaching writing and ESL is a crucial component of such a course. We take the overwhelming acknowledgement of success as a by-product of the teacher's ability to effectively support all students not only as writers, but also as language learners and cultural beings. As shown in findings, the EAP students were somewhat more preoccupied with their linguistic performance. A number of their comments reflected on the course's success in instilling higher confidence and facilitating new ways of conceptualizing the importance of accents and accuracy. Furthermore, several comments explicitly related student success to the teacher's skill and approach. In her own assessment, Cohen notes that, thanks to her training and experience in ESL, she is aware of what to expect from students, how to focus on language for both EAP and WP students, and how to guide all students to consider topics from multiple cultural perspectives. Indeed, our WP students also testified that they had to think about others' and their own language in new and deeper ways as a result of the course. Shuck and Wilber (2018), like us, noted that multilingual students in particular value having a trained second language instructor (p.177). ESL training for teachers of ESL and multilingual writers remains important, as also stressed in the most recent version of the *CCCC Position Statement on Second Language Writing and Multilingual Writers* ("CCC Position Statement," 2020).

Concerns about teaching WP and EAP students together often stem from the view that the two groups have fundamental linguistic differences and needs. Our study found that, as writers, the students reported having the same type of challenges; these were only slightly more exacerbated among the EAP students (who may be culturally biased towards assessing

24

themselves more harshly to begin with). Unlike in other studies (Mina & Cimasko, 2020; Shuck & Wilber, 2018), our EAP students seemed to overcome the discomfort of interacting with WP students quickly. They displayed a higher level of readiness and appetite for gaining cultural knowledge. Linguistically, they tended to hyper-focus on formal linguistic aspects in their early reflections on linguistic development. We are encouraged by the fact that both EAP and WP students experienced shifts in their thinking and relationship with course topics, as well as ideas about language-identity and language-writing relationships. In line with Martins and Van Horn (2018), we argue that the teachers of internationalized courses need to embrace the goal of focusing on raising linguistic and cultural awareness, and more generally intercultural competence, especially among the monolingual, monocultural WP students. This is a goal for us in future internationalized writing courses and a way to cultivate our students' translingual "disposition of openness and inquiry [that people take] toward language and language differences" (Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011, p. 311).

Conclusions

There are multiple benefits of internationalizing writing courses: improved cultural knowledge and understanding; improved mastery and understanding of the writing process; increased confidence in one's ability to communicate in speech and writing; increased language awareness; exposure to difference; exposure to topics not typically addressed in one's culture; exposure to new or unfamiliar perspectives; and increased awareness of self and others. Our positive experience with the three iterations of our internationalized FYW course recommends it as a model that can be adapted by other EAP and WP programs. The collaboration between EAP and WP specialists proved fruitful in our case, and we join others in recommending that program and university administrators should work together on curriculum internationalization, building

on the strengths of each program to create innovative curricula (Weiser & Rose, 2018). In our own context and others, FYW course goals could be revisited at programmatic level to incorporate the cultural understanding goals that guide the EAP curriculum, in line with the larger institutionally outlined dimensions of global learning. IUPUI's goals entail enabling "all IUPUI students to have at least one substantial global learning experience during his or her IUPUI career, either internationally or locally," and create opportunities for students to "analyze their own beliefs, values, assumptions, experiences, and/or communication styles in respect to those of at least one other culture" ("IUPUI Dimensions," 2020). In this, our campus is representative of higher education institutions in the U.S. It is more important than ever to make it possible for all students to have a global learning experience at home, given the limited access to study abroad and the importance of intercultural competence in life and workplaces today. As we write this chapter amid the COVID-19 pandemic, we are even more aware of the importance of internationalizing-at-home, through our curriculum. We see FYW as a hot bed for internationalizing at home and offering all students a global learning experience in collaboration with EAP programs.

References

Andrade, M.S. (2006). International students in English-speaking universities: Adjustment

    factors. *Journal of Research in International Education, 5*(2), 131-154.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240906065589

Braine, G. (1996). ESL students in first-year writing courses: ESL versus mainstream classes.

    Journal of Second Language Writing, 5(2), 91-107. doi:10.1016/s1060-3743(96)90020-x

Canagarajah, S. (2016). Translingual writing and teacher development in composition. *College*

    English, 78(3), 265-273.

Conference on College Composition & Communication. (2020). CCC position statement: CCC

    statement on second language writing and multilingual writers. Retrieved from

    https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/secondlangwriting?fbclid=IwAR2DceB7W

    Sh-NnaD6VUFadx47gTnt8YqzvMbflk1ehKrFlsAwGi0kEphnlc

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

Ene, E., & Burrup, J. (2001, February 28). *Designing cross-cultural composition courses.*

    [Conference presentation]. TESOL conference, St. Louis, MI, USA.

Ene, E., & Liu, J. (2003). *Multicultural composition courses: A viable placement option.*

    Unpublished manuscript.

Gale: A Cengage Company. (2020). *Gale in context: Opposing viewpoints*. Retrieved from

    https://www.gale.com/c/in-context-opposing-viewpoints

Horner, B., Lu, M. Z., Royster, J. J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Opinion: Language difference in

    writing: toward a translingual approach. *College English, 73*(3), 303-321.

IUPUI Office of International Affairs: Curriculum Internationalization. (2020). IUPUI

    dimensions of global learning: Developing global mindsets for all IUPUI students.

    Retrieved from https://international.iupui.edu/global-learning/curriculum-

    internationalization/global-dimensions.html.

IUPUI Office of International Affairs. (2020). Strategic planning: International planning efforts

    are expanding IUPUI's strong foundation of global engagement. Retrieved from

    https://international.iupui.edu/about/planning.html

IUPUI School of Liberal Arts Department of English. (2018). W131: Reading, writing, &

    inquiry. Retrieved from

    https://liberalarts.iupui.edu/english/pages/writing-program-folder/courses.php

Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education,*

    33, 2-3. doi:10.6017/ihe.2003.33.7391

Liu, J. (2001). *Asian students' classroom communication patterns in U.S. universities: An emic*

    perspective. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Marinoni, G., & de Wit, H. (2019). Is strategic internationalization a reality? *International*

    Higher Education, *98*, 12-13.

Martins, D. S. & Van Horn, S. (2018). "I am no longer sure this serves our students well":

    Redesigning FYW to prepare students for transnational literacy. In S. K. Rose & I.

    Weiser (Eds.), *The Internationalization of U.S. Writing Programs* (pp.151-169).

    Louisville: Utah State University Press. doi: 7330/9781607326762.c008

Matsuda, P. K. (2010). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. In B.

    Horner, M. Lu, & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Cross Language Relations in Composition* (pp.

    81-96). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Matsuda, P., & Silva, T. (1999). Cross-cultural composition: Mediated integration of US and international students. *Composition Studies, 27*(1), 15-30.

Matsuda, P. K., & Silva, T. (2011). Cross-cultural composition: Mediated integration of U.S. and international students. In P. K. Matsuda, M. Cox, J. Jordan, & C. Ortmeier-Hooper (Eds.), *Second-Language Writing in the Composition Classroom: A Critical Sourcebook* (pp. 252-265). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Mina, L. & Cimasko, T. (2020). Expectations, mismatches, and translingual dispositions in teaching multilingual students. In A. Frost, J. Kiernan, & S.B. Malley (Eds.), *Translingual dispositions: Globalized approaches to the teaching of writing* (pp. 63-80). Fort Collins: The WAC Clearinghouse & Louisville: University Press of Colorado. doi: https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2020.0438.2.03

Pierson, S. J. (2014). The power of story: Using personal narrative, computer technology, and podcasting with young adult English language learners. *Teaching English with Technology, 14*(4), 3-16.

Ramage, J. D, Bean, J. C, & Johnson, J. (2006). *The Allyn & Bacon guide to writing.* Custom ed., 4th ed. New York: Pearson/Longman.

Rose, S.K. & Weiser, I. (Eds.). (2018). *The internationalization of U.S. writing programs*. Louisville: University Press of Colorado & Utah State University Press. doi: 10.7330/9781607326762.c000

Shuck, G., & Wilber, D. (2018). "Holding the language in my hand": A multilingual lens on curricular design. In S.K. Rose & I. Weiser (Eds.), *The Internationalization of U.S. Writing Programs* (pp.168-184). Louisville: University Press of Colorado & Utah State University Press.

Silva, T. (1994). An examination of Writing Program administrators' options for the placement

      of ESL students in first year writing classes. *Writing Program Administration, 18,* 37-43.

Weinstein, G. (2006). Learners' lives as curriculum: An integrative project-based model for

      language learning. In Beckett, G. H. & Chamness Miller, P. (Eds.), *Project-based second*

      and foreign language education: Past, present and future (pp. 159-165). Greenwich, CT:

      Information Age Publishing.

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). Louisville: University Press of

      Colorado. doi: 10.7330/9781607326762.c000

Williams, K, Woolliams, M., and Spiro, J. (2012). *Reflective writing*. Basingstoke: Palgrave

      MacMillan.

Yam, S. (2018). Interrogating the "Deep Story": Storytelling and narratives in the rhetoric

      classroom. *Composition Forum*, *40*. Retrieved from

      http://www.compositionforum.com/issue/40/