Introduction: L2 Expertise in Curriculum Internationalization

Matthew Allen, Estela Ene, and Kyle McIntosh

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 geopolitical, economic, and sociocultural environments. Many colleges and universities around the world continue to pursue internationalization in terms of student populations, research programs, and institutional partnerships, but frequently the curriculum and instruction remain rooted in a unidirectional model that aims primarily to help international students adapt to the existing norms and expectations of the local community. Too often, linguistic and cultural differences among students 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. As Jones and Killick (2007) pointed out, "responding to the diversity of international students and responding to the diversity of home students are in fact not two agendas but one" (p. 110). This comprehensive view demands that more attention be given to cultivating the *international/ global* in all students while supporting the specific needs of unique student populations and learning contexts.

As colleges and universities recognize the importance of these goals and the ethical obligations to support international students as a distinct population, they are faced with an important logistical challenge: how to build more globally aware programs and pedagogies into the

local campus to make transformative practices and outcomes available to everyone. This book provides case studies from higher educational contexts to represent the diverse ways that second language (L2) specialists can build programs and courses that contribute to their institutions' internationalization by promoting language and cultural exchange. We present examples of internationalization through the curriculum and co-curriculum in a variety of countries to highlight ways in which L2 specialists and programs have advanced internationalization by diversifying support for international students and creating engagement between international and local students, for the benefit of both.

Internationalization of Higher Education

Internationalization of higher education (IoHE), in de Wit and Hunter's (2015) revision of 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 one motivation is the promise of increased tuition dollars and other forms of revenue, IoHE has substantive merits for participants; notably, it facilitates more diverse exchanges of knowledge among researchers and better prepares students to live and work in the global environments of the 21st century (Hudzik, 2011).

IoHE has been occurring in the larger context of increased mobility created by a globalized economy that, over the last 30 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 (2020), more than 340,000 U.S. university students studied abroad as part of their degree programs in 2017–2018 (with most studying for less than an academic or calendar year). Additionally, many students from other countries come to the United States or go to other host countries 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 in terms of annual percentage growth since the 2015–2016 academic year, 1,095,299 international students came to the United States during the 2018–2019 academic year (Institute of International Education, 2020). Similarly, in 2017, 1.7 million students from abroad studied at universities across the 28 states of the European Union (Eurostat, 2019). Although during the COVID-19 pandemic student mobility decreased dramatically, experts believe it will remain an essential component of IoHE, as there is no substitute for the first-hand experience one gains through travel (de Wit & Jones, 2021). Other means of achieving IoHE present more accessible alternatives, such as virtual exchanges and internationalization-at-home strategies.

Internationalization Abroad and at Home

IoHE is a complex phenomenon that 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 hiring, 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 foreign destinations, 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 lead to transformative, measurable learning outcomes (Deardorff, 2015). In particular, both types of internationalization can improve the intercultural competence of those involved. Deardorff (2006) defined intercultural competence as the "ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural

knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (p. 241). Deardorff (2015) expanded that earlier definition into a model whose essential elements include knowledge (of one's own and others' perspectives), skills (ranging from observing and listening to adapting one's thinking and behavior to other cultures), and attitudes (of openness, curiosity, and respect toward other perspectives).

Within IaH, *curriculum internationalization* stands out as a means to disseminate the goals of internationalization—increased intercultural knowledge and sensitivity, an understanding of the relationships between the local and the global, and positive attitudes of respect and curiosity toward other cultures—throughout any and all subjects taught. Since learning happens in ungraded activities outside the classroom, at academic support services, and in informal interactions, it follows that the co-curriculum needs to be as internationalized as the curriculum (Leask, 2015). Furthermore, it is evident that for internationalization to work to everyone's benefit, it needs to be comprehensive: preparation for it and participation in it has to include all faculty, staff, students, curriculum, services, etc. (Hudzik, 2011). Finally, comprehensive internationalization requires interculturalization (Jones, 2019); if the actors involved in campus life become more interculturally involved and competent, the deeper goals of internationalization can be accomplished. This volume provides examples of curricular and co-curricular designs in which L2 specialists and programs advance those deeper goals.

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 et al., 2016; Charles & Deardorff, 2014). Their peers and teachers, as well as others in the communities where these international students live, work, or volunteer, also benefit by developing more global mindsets and intercultural competence (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 Goals and Challenges of Internationalization Abroad and at Home

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, recent scholarship has shown this assumption to be more myth than reality (Castro et al., 2016; Vande Berg, Paige, & Lou, 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" (see 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 toward 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 (Charles & Deardorff, 2014; Hudzik, 2011).

Finally, the development of not only second language (L2) proficiency but also intercultural competency for all are at a high premium in IaH. 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 the 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) emphasized, all learning experiences are situated in specific cultural and linguistic contexts. In their work on learning in study abroad, they have made the point that students will get much more out of their trips abroad if they are prepared 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 that educators can use as catalysts to revise or expand their praxis include the AAC&U (2009) VALUE rubric for Intercultural Knowledge and Competence, the AAC&U (2014) VALUE rubric for Global Learning, 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 will argue, it is important to recognize that L2 specialists and programs are vital resources for training other faculty, collaborating across academic units, and spearheading co-curricular activities. By virtue of their expertise, L2 specialists and programs 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 these 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 are pondering similar questions in their own educational contexts. This volume, therefore, 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 wit-

nessed 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. Given such realities, we have worked on our campuses to explore practical approaches to the ways that language and cultural differences among students can become opportunities to enrich and enhance the quality of post-secondary education for all students and faculty, rather than barriers to communication and understanding.

Based on our experiences and observations of trends in higher education, we know that 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 and/ or 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/English for Academic Purposes (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, this collection 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, international teaching assistant (ITA) support); (2) among those in higher education who tend to orient toward their disciplinary val-

ues, conventions, and practices; and (3) among L2 specialists and other educators who may find it challenging to make meaningful curricular 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 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" (Jones & de Wit, 2014, p. 28), in many contexts, internationalization continues to be tied to learning English (Weiser & Rose, 2018). The influx of international students to universities in English-dominant countries solidifies the need to learn English before and during the students' stay, strengthening the status of English as a global lingua franca. At the same time, to remain competitive, higher education institutions around the world 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 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."

This Collection in Context

Building Internationalized Spaces 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 regard 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 these boundaries in higher education.

A few recent contributions by scholars in such fields as applied linguistics, TESOL, and writing studies have made an explicit connection between professionals in these areas and internationalization. For example, Rose and Weiser (2018) noted in their edited volume of perspectives of various writing program administrators 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" (p. 7). While offering clear guidance for internationalizing the writing curriculum, Lape (2020) contends in only an implicit way with aspects of teaching English to international students in the context of writing courses. Siczek and Shapiro (2014) present TESOL/EAP-Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) collaborations as a way to promote not only internationalization and global learning for all but also diversity, equity, and inclusion goals. Bond (2020) argues that language learning is vital to internationalization efforts and must be foregrounded across the curriculum. She then 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 EAP and their colleagues in other disciplines.

While we agree that more needs to be done to bridge such gaps, we also feel that it is important to recognize successful attempts at integrat-

ing English language–learning international students into the campus through the curriculum or co-curriculum and to 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 and the work presented in this volume. Because the realization of IaH values and goals is still emerging, much work lies ahead for curriculum and program development as well as in research to measure the effects and effectiveness on student learning. This volume serves a bridging role to connect the broad set of values related to internationalization, on the one hand, to students using a second language to study in international contexts or global programs.

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 instructors. We encouraged the authors to take a grounded approach to writing about internationalization efforts where they live. Framing it within the work they do on their respective campuses, the authors in this volume examine institutional internationalization through the lenses of language learning and intercultural engagement. Each chapter offers a distinct perspective on L2 learning and the intercultural development of adult learners in different academic settings. The authors provide suggestions for how L2 specialists can reframe their work in 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 programs, such as:

- ❍ orientation programs (early arrival on campus, before classes start)
- ❍ language center contexts (support during studies)
- ❍ volunteer programs for ITAs and undergraduate students
- ❍ graduate-level writing support structures

❍ instructional design (virtual learning spaces)

❍ co-curricular virtual partner programs

❍ intercultural composition (i.e., promoting intentional 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 collection offers options and approaches that have been developed to fit the needs and circumstances of a specific context but that could be adapted for other contexts.

This collection is intentionally international in its focus. We invited authors from both outside and inside the United States to participate, targeting spaces in the curriculum and on campus where language and cultural exchange efforts could be highlighted and developed further (see Leask, 2015). The chapters in Part I detail efforts at four universities around the world 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 1, Chiocca, Davies, Davies, Hiller, Naghib, Sprague, and Zhang address the immersion myth head-on by stressing the need for explicit instruction in language and intercultural awareness from the moment students arrive on campus. The authors provide an overview of the four-day student orientation program at Duke Kunshan University (DKU), during which 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 that may or may not count toward graduation. After completing such a course, international and domestic multilingual students may find

themselves taking other courses that pay little attention to their specific needs or unique perspectives. In Chapter 2, McMartin-Miller addresses this shortcoming in her chronicle of 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 for multilingual students, from career preparation to casual conversation. This case study shows the importance of having a designated unit on campus that can provide ongoing, multifaceted language and culture support.

Advancements in digital technologies present a range of possibilities for offering such support beyond traditional classroom settings. In Chapter 3, 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 not only "change our students' understanding of themselves and others, but [also show] that they can change others' preconceived notions and expectations about what it means to be an international student" (p. TBD).

The final two chapters in Part I describe partner programs that are embedded in English-language courses at two universities. In Chapter 4, Rodríguez-Fuentes, Corrales, Paba, and Rosado-Mendinueta discuss the implementation of virtual exchanges (VEs) between students at Universidad del Norte in Colombia and Spanish student partners at a U.S. university that 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 5, Cheng provides the historical institutional context for internationalization efforts at Purdue University to show how a program that connects undergraduate domestic students with ITAs 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 chapters included in Part II 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. The section moves from general to specific, beginning with an administrative perspective on cross-cultural composition and then moving to implementations in writing classrooms and writing centers. In Chapter 6, Saenkhum and Soblo provide an overview of the assessment and placement options that the composition program at the University of Tennessee (Knoxville) has 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 7, Ene and Cohen present the case of a multicultural composition course at Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) that aligns with the campus' 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. Similarly, in Chapter 8, Gherwash explains how internationalization efforts at Colby College, a small liberal arts college in the United States, 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 9, 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 Part II 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. Given the importance of writing in the academy, we further believe that this multifaceted consideration of writing spaces can help to make inroads into thinking about how to internationalize other areas of the curriculum.

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 and 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

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2014). *Global learning VALUE rubric.* Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/global-learning

Berardo, K., & Deardorff, D. K. (2012). *Building cultural competence: Innovative activities and models.* Sterling, VA: 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). Dordrecht, Netherlands: SpringerOpen. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_5

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.* Bristol, England: 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.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

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, England: Cambridge University Press.

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

de Wit, H., & Jones, E. (2021, June 9). *Internationalization as a global field.* Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VQwahHy7GyM

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). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

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). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Hudzik, J. K. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization.* Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Institute of International Education (2020). 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.

Jones, E. (2019). Is it time to pursue "interculturalisation"? *Times Higher Education* September 26, 2019. https://timeshighereducation.com/opinion/it-time-pursue -interculturalization

Jones, E., & de Wit, H. (Spring 2014). "Globalized internationalization: Implications for policy and practice." IIEnetworker (pp. 28–29).

Jones, E., & Killick, D. (2007). Internationalization of the curriculum. In Jones, E., & Brown, S. (Eds.), *Internationalizing higher education* (pp. 109–119). London: Routledge.

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.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Lape, N. G. (2020). *Internationalizing the writing center: A guide for developing a multilingual writing center.* Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing the curriculum.* New York: Routledge.

Nilsson, B. (2003). Internationalisation at home from a Swedish perspective: The case of Malmö. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7*(1), 27–40. doi:10.1177/1028315302250178

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). Fort Collins, CO: 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.* Sterling, VA: 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 program*s (pp. 1–10). Logan: Utah State University Press.