Tran, P., Panahi, P., & Dilger, B. (Accepted/In press). Developing intercultural competence through a linked course model curriculum: mainstream and L2-specific first year writing. *TESOL Journal*.

Developing Intercultural Competence through a Linked Course Model Curriculum: Mainstream and L2-Specific First Year Writing

Hadi Banat[1] | Rebekah Sims[2] | Phuong Tran[3] | Parva Panahi[4] | Bradley Dilger[4]

[1]University of Massachusetts Boston
[2] University of Strathclyde
[3] University of Toronto Mississauga
[4] Purdue University

ABSTRACT

Institutions of higher education in the United States continue to witness a dramatic shift in the spectrum of diversity within their student populations. Multiple variables of difference that mixed student demographics bring to our university campuses make internationalization work necessary both inside and outside the classroom. Internationalization of higher education is a collaborative responsibility academic and non-academic programs should share to facilitate the integration of various student populations within the broader culture of the university. However, there are few, if any, models for internationalizing introductory courses required of a large percentage of the student body such as First Year Writing (FYW). In this article, we propose and argue for an intercultural competence-oriented approach to internationalizing writing programs through a linked course model curriculum which pairs international and domestic students in separate L2-specific and mainstream FYW classes. The linked course model curriculum develops and assesses students' intercultural learning and writing skills as core learning outcomes. This article presents the curricular design and interventions, the research design of the study conducted across three semesters of curriculum implementation, and the reflective writing results from the pilot semester to communicate the preliminary effectiveness of this curricular model.

1| INTRODUCTION

The mixed demographics of domestic and international students in US institutions of higher education have brought serious attention to the need for intensifying internationalization work, which is ordinarily implemented outside of classrooms: through study abroad programs, international student and faculty recruitment, student organizations and cultural centers. On campus, however, both domestic and international students experience social and academic barriers in their transitions from K-12 to post-secondary education. Crucially, research on international students' integration and success in American universities has found that social support and multicultural competence are key factors in cross-cultural adjustment and dealing with the stress of university environments (Baba & Hosoda, 2014; Yakunina et

al, 2013). However, there are few, if any, models for implementation of intercultural competence pedagogy in general education courses such as First Year Writing. Writing classes are prime spaces for meaningful cross-cultural learning and development of intercultural competence because they are small communities which offer rich opportunities for interaction, collaboration, and reflection. Thus, they can provide both domestic and international students with instruction that prepares them for diverse educational and work environments.

We observed that diverse student populations on our campus tend to self-segregate, so we committed to designing a curriculum that triggers systematic interactions among diverse groups of undergraduate students. The integration of international and intercultural elements in curricula prepare all students for global multicultural contexts, an inclusive and efficient approach to internationalizing US classrooms. Rose and Weiser (2018) invite us – writing program administrators, TESOL specialists, and teacher-scholars – to contribute to rhetorical, pedagogical, and learning theories by utilizing our unique institutional and classroom contexts for that purpose. Inspired by this value, we designed a curriculum to develop intercultural competence in paired mainstream and L2-specific First Year Writing (FYW) classes. While the writing program at our institution regularly administers mainstream and L2-specific FYW courses as separate sections, our curriculum links sections of these courses for the purpose of intercultural exposure, exchange and learning. Our students engage in structured intercultural interactions, complete a sequence of culture-focused research writing assignments, and read diverse multicultural texts. Each of these interventions is supported by a series of team-taught class sessions facilitated via the linked-course model.

Inspired by a desire to promote interdisciplinary research engaging second language studies, rhetoric and composition, and education, we propose an intercultural-competence-oriented approach for internationalizing writing curricula by sharing interventions that highlight the intersections of language, writing, and culture. This approach to teaching FYW not only focuses on developing linguistic, rhetorical, and writing proficiency of multilingual and domestic students, but activates and promotes inclusivity of their cultural capital. The linked course model curriculum provides meaningful and purposeful cross-cultural interaction, allowing all students to learn core elements of intercultural competence: building interpersonal bonds, joining communities of practice based on trustworthy relationships, and developing effective communication skills by engaging peers with embodied and hidden differences. Thus, students work on developing and coordinating an "intercultural mindset and skillset" (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 149). In this article, we describe the curricular interventions we developed and situate them in our institutional context. We then offer a preliminary evaluation of their effectiveness for developing students' intercultural competence and writing skills by analyzing students' reflective writing from the pilot phase of a research project designed to assess and develop this curriculum on the long term.

2| INTERNATIONALIZATION OF WRITING PROGRAMS

In response to the shifting demographics of students, US institutions of higher education have attended to integrating "international and intercultural dimensions into their teaching, research, and service functions" to prepare students for multicultural contexts and transform them into global citizens (Knight, 2004, p. 6). These institutional interventions have helped students respond to the diversity they witness daily on their campuses. Inspired by internationalization efforts usually taking place outside the classroom, writing program administrators have developed a "keen awareness of and attention to changes in the local

context of writing programs, and of the ideological and political positioning that enables them to serve as agents in bringing about meaningful change for all students" (Martins, 2015, p. 4). Some initiatives have focused on transnational writing program work, which fundamentally involves "students and faculty from two or more countries working together and highlights the situated practices of such efforts" (Martins, 2015, p. 2). Similar internationalization initiatives, though, are more easily administered when situated on the same campus. Nilsson (2003) enforced the practice of internationalization at home, i.e., within the same institution, an approach which encompasses a broader student audience with a more inclusive ethos. This approach develops students' potential to build cross-cultural relationships and increases tolerance and respect for diversity in the context of intercultural settings created by the differences that various student populations, cultures, and identities bring to the institution (Haan, 2018).

Similar to internationalization-at-home efforts, our curricular project advances intercultural competence to take advantage of the resources made possible through the presence of linguistic, cultural, and identity diversity in FYW classes. However, unlike popular misconceptions about internationalization-at-home initiatives which assume that "the outcomes will occur automatically, as a direct consequence of just being there" (Baldassar & McKenzie, 2016, p. 84), our approach emphasizes that infusing intercultural dimensions into US writing programs requires sustained curricular and pedagogical interventions. Such intentional course design fosters students' abilities to engage with the global plurality of knowledge, develop an awareness of their own and others' cultures, recognize and appreciate different cultural perspectives on the same issue, and apply critical thinking skills to problems with an intercultural dimension (Jones & Killick, 2007).

We adopted Deardorff's (2006) widely accepted definition of intercultural competence: the "ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations [according to] one's intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (p. 194). According to Deardorff (2006), there are two outcomes for this knowledge – an internal and external one. The desired internal outcome is an informed frame of reference that (1) enables interculturally competent individuals to adapt to different communication styles, behaviors, and new cultural environments; (2) demonstrates flexibility in selecting and using appropriate communication styles and behaviors which further reflect cognitive flexibility; and (3) portrays ethnorelative views and empathy. The desired external outcome, on the other hand, includes behaving and communicating effectively and appropriately based on one's knowledge, skills, and attitudes. These outcomes recognize that intercultural competence, as a construct, embeds behavioral, cognitive, and affective dimensions. For Deardorff, developing intercultural competence is an ongoing process of growth and skillset acquisition. Both our curricular approach and assessment measures operationalize the construct according to its three dimensions and its developmental nature.

3| ENACTED CURRICULUM

Purdue University attracts a significant international student population from China, India, and South Korea. The English proficiency admission requirement for international students is a total score of 80-88 on the internet based TOEFL exam, with no subscale score lower than 20, or an overall score of 6.5 on the IELTS exam with no score lower than 6 on any of the subskills. Recent recruitment efforts have diversified the international student demographics and targeted underrepresented minority domestic students in an attempt to balance US-based diversity representation (race, in-state/out-of-state, first generation) on campus. Purdue

requires a single one-semester FYW course. Most sections enroll primarily domestic students, but there are dedicated sections for international students, as well as accelerated sections and sections for specific programs (such as Learning Communities). The traditional approach of placing domestic and international students in separate FYW sections is intended to offer specialized linguistic support for L2 writers, richer opportunities for drafting, and more structured scaffolding of writing skills. Moreover, it provides L2 writers with a community of peers who could have parallel prior experiences and face parallel challenges and needs. But this traditional approach does not provide opportunities for rich interactions between domestic and international students, an important consideration for acculturating both groups of students to a diverse campus. Thus, the placement of domestic and international students in separate FYW sections at Purdue created the exigency for linking sections to maximize interactions between these two student populations.

Our curriculum design maximizes both cultural exposure and interaction through four main interventions: co-teaching of paired L2-specific and mainstream FYW sections, a multicultural reader, a research and writing based assignment sequence, and embedded systematic reflective writing. The variety in interventions and assignment sequence design do not only emphasize cultural learning; they also focus on the learning of new writing genres and present participants with "a host of new rhetorical situations, new ways of thinking, and new roles as writers" (Beaufort, 2007, p. 8). Attention to multiple rhetorical contexts develops their critical thinking skills as the meaningful purpose of intercultural competence focuses the assigned research, writing, and collaborative tasks.

3.1 | Intervention one: Paired sections and co-teaching

Linking sections is an innovative, inexpensive, and practical intervention at institutions that offer separate sections of mainstream and L2-specific FYW. This primary innovation in our model also reduces the domestic-international divide that independent sections of FYW can maintain during students' first years of college (e.g., Siczek & Shapiro, 2014). The linked section model also addresses the administrative, logistic, and infrastructural hurdles that Matsuda and Silva (1999) encountered at Purdue when teaching a cross-cultural composition course adopting an integrated model.

Paired instructors meet with their linked mainstream and L2-specific sections once every three weeks, for a total of five co-teaching sessions. These paired meetings bring domestic and international students together in one classroom space to collaborate on activities related to their multicultural reader texts, research projects, and writing assignments. Instructors offer advice on developing and coordinating group work skills. During these sessions, students can work with multiple peers, thus acquiring opportunities for cultural exposure and interaction with others having a variety of worldviews and frames of reference.

The co-teaching sessions are placed strategically in the course calendar to facilitate connections among various curricular components and provide extensive intercultural experiences for students, thus strengthening both cultural exposure and interaction (see Table 1). For example, the first scheduled paired meeting, in week three, focuses on introducing domestic and international students to the ethics of conducting primary research and helps students from separate sections coordinate meeting times outside class to conduct interviews. Instructors can work together to mentor students, reinforce the purpose of these sessions, explain the goals of each interaction, and ensure the scaffolding of assignments and other curricular interventions. The teacher-scholars implementing the linked course model meet a

week in advance of the co-teaching session and collaboratively work on the lesson plan. In addition to designing lesson plans that include parallel support to the main curricular interventions, we discuss the needs of both mainstream and L2 students as observed through formative assessment. Every pair of instructors can exercise some autonomy to tailor the general lesson plan for their student needs and continuous development in both writing and intercultural skills.

"Insert Table 1 about here"

3.2 | Intervention two: Multicultural Reader

The multicultural reader is a collection of literary texts by multicultural and multilingual authors, in outer and expanding circle contexts (Kachru, 1990) (i.e. in countries where English is not the first language). We selected the multicultural reader texts based on the following criteria: (1) content which include controversial and conventional culture-related themes, topics and concepts; (2) content which address cultural issues in various multicultural settings (e.g. US vs. non-US, local vs. global, developed vs. developing, conventional vs. unconventional); and (3) diversity in choice of authors with regards to *nationality* (e.g., American vs. non-American), *gender* (e.g., male vs. female), *socio-cultural status* (e.g., US citizen vs. immigrant, majority vs. minority), and *language background* (e.g., native vs. non-native speakers of English, monolinguals vs. multilinguals, speakers of standard English vs. speakers of English varieties). These criteria ensure a culturally representative and inclusive reader reflecting the diversity of students—a premise integral to intercultural teaching (Lee, 2017). The readings were then organized into themes of identity, language, education, globalization, technology, gender, relationships, power dynamics, and workplace environments. For a list of readings, please visit the project website [writeic.org].

The reader offers students exposure to often familiar themes and concepts, but through the eyes of multicultural authors, encouraging reflection and perspective. Students are asked to respond to these texts through reflective journals, classroom activities, and conferencing sessions. In classroom activities and discussions, students are encouraged to analyze, deconstruct arguments, and express their perspectives in response to these texts. This opportunity creates a "contact zone" (Pratt, 1991) in class, where various perspectives and ideologies meet and grapple, thus spurring dynamic discussions. The reader provides students with multicultural thematic knowledge, yet it is not sufficient to help students fully develop the ability to understand and work across difference. The purposeful design of classroom activities which maximize interaction and develop observation, conceptual thinking, and reflection skills overcomes the limitations of solely depending on multicultural readers (Jordan, 2005). Instead, actively connecting reading to writing, research, and group collaboration promotes the intercultural benefits of reading and reflecting on multicultural texts.

3.3| Intervention three: Writing assignment sequence

Our research- and writing-based assignment sequence requires a significant amount of collaboration between international and domestic students. This sequence provides opportunities for cross-cultural interaction through collaborative research and writing tasks, building teamwork skills while simultaneously meeting FYW learning outcomes pertaining to writing skill development. The first project is a case study report pairing domestic and

international students. Each student learns about their partner's socio-cultural background by conducting primary and secondary research. Students interview their partners twice and engage in social activities to observe the behaviors of their partners in extra-curricular contexts. Then, students compose case-study reports describing what they have learned about their partners. The aim of this assignment, apart from teaching students how to conduct primary research, is to raise their awareness about potential stereotypes and misconceptions they may have about a representative coming from another culture or community (O'Bryan, 2005). Through primary research, reading secondary sources, and social interactions, students gain more comprehensive and accurate understanding of different cultures and communities.

Afterwards, students work on a cultural inquiry assignment that requires the investigation of a cultural phenomenon of their choosing outside their home culture. Most of the students choose topics and cultural destinations based on their interactions with their peers from the case study project. For this second project, students learn more about the particularities of library research detailing source text evaluation, selection, and use. They compose research proposals, compile annotated bibliographies of both scholarly and popular sources, and report their findings in argumentative research reports. This project develops students' skills to conduct scholarly inquiry, do library research, and frame evidence from source texts in writing. With the use of different types of sources, students can develop cultural sensitivity towards events or phenomena that happen in foreign international cultures or domestic sub-cultures.

The third project requires students to present their inquiry from the second project in a multimodal form, such as a website or a poster. Students thus learn how writing as a technology restructures thought by using commonplace software such as Canva, Piktochart, or WordPress to create media that effectively construct or support their researched arguments for a transcultural audience. Thus, it fosters students' rhetorical and multimodal literacies to practice cultural sensitivity. Students also learn how to remediate written content and integrate visuals to present arguments within different rhetorical situations. In this assignment, students evaluate design features and make choices as they navigate the dynamics of delivery and publishing in digital spaces.

3.4 | Intervention four: Reflective journals

Alongside the writing projects, students compose four short reflections on their learning experiences in the course or concurrent cultural experiences from inside or outside of the classroom. Wilbur (2016) argues that reflective inquiry can promote students' active interaction with difference. In these reflective journals, students connect their reflections with the concepts and themes discussed in class, developing their cultural sensitivity and competence. Instructor feedback offers mentoring for this systematic self-expression and formative assessment of student learning. We strategically situated the reflective journals within interventions to scaffold reflective practice and present students with an opportunity to connect various curricular interventions, classroom activities, and other concurrent campus experiences. These reflective tasks also align with Yancey's (1998) "reflection-in-presentation" where student writers use their own words to express what they have learned about writing. Due to the dual focus of our curriculum, participants reflect on both writing and cultural learning. There are no specific prompts designed for reflective journals, but students are provided guidance on a spectrum of possible topics related to course concepts or concurrent cultural experiences from outside the classroom.

The final component is a written reflection about students' cultural learning and writing skill development. It is not an evaluation of instructors or the course but continues the reflection students engage through the four reflective journals. However, the final reflective essay asks students to distance themselves from particular curricular interventions to review their experiences with the curriculum holistically, explaining what influences their sociocultural and academic growth as researchers, writers, and collaborators. Students can choose from seven specific prompts to compose a reflective essay which synthesizes their experiences with the curriculum and expresses how those influence their learning.

Our curricular interventions do not promote intercultural competence at the expense of meeting FYW outcomes and developing writing skills. The skills students develop through the writing and research projects help meet the learning outcomes endorsed by the Council of Writing Program Administrators' Outcomes Statement for FYW (2014). Students develop rhetorical, process, and genre knowledge, and engage in reading and composing activities which build their critical thinking skills.

4| Research methods

As teacher-scholars, we value curricula shaped by data-driven evaluation. To this end, our linked-course model is supported by a mixed-methods research design intended to help us assess and refine our work over time. This research employed a multi-method, multi-perspective assessment plan (Deardorff, 2011) that examined intercultural growth in students over and beyond the course of intervention. We, the curriculum designers and teacher-researchers, collected data from multiple sources, for both direct measures (students' reflective journals and culture-themed writing projects) and indirect measures (pre- and post-survey scores from an intercultural competency scale and students' interview responses) (Deardorff, 2011). Using analysis of reflective writing, results from Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity (MGUDS) scale, and post semester interviews, we have conducted formative, summative and delayed assessments of students' intercultural growth and evaluated the effectiveness of the designed interventions. The data collected from the entire study answer two broad research questions: (1) How can FYW curricula effectively develop all students' intercultural competence and better promote social and academic adjustment for international and diverse domestic students?; (2) How can we assess the effects of the curriculum on improving students' intercultural competence? In this section, we provide context on participant recruitment from the entire study but focus on our methodological approach to reflective writing data analysis from the one-semester pilot.

4.1| Data Collection

Participants enrolled in this IRB-approved study come from eight FYW sections —both mainstream and L2-specific—spanning three semesters. Our focus here is the first semester of implementation, Spring 2017, which we consider the pilot phase of our project. Two sections were linked, and eight students were recruited to participate in the study. Afterwards, twenty-one student participants were recruited from two linked sections in Fall 2017. In Spring 2018, the project expanded to another set of two linked sections, where twenty-nine student participants were recruited from all four sections, for a total of 58 participants to date. The following table shows the numbers of participants recruited from mainstream and L2-specific FYW across the entire study.

“Insert Table 2 about here”

Participants were not recruited by their instructors, but members of our research team. After obtaining informed consent, we collected student participant writing after the end of the semester by downloading texts from our learning management system. We collaboratively processed participants’ texts, deidentified them, and stored them on a secure server space provided by our institution. The data examined here come from the five reflective texts each student participant wrote during the semester; thus, our pilot semester includes a total of 40 reflective texts.

4.2 | Data Analysis

Adopting Saldaña’s (2016) descriptive coding framework, we applied thematic coding analysis of reflective writing and traced frequencies of codes. To bracket potential instructor researcher participant bias, undergraduate researchers who did not teach the course received training to use the grounded coding scheme designed by the graduate researchers (teacher scholars on the team). After familiarizing themselves with the project, team practices, and scholarly readings about qualitative research inquiry, the undergraduate researchers coded samples from the pilot data set. During their coding training, they posed important questions which contributed to redefining certain codes and removing unnecessary ones. They also composed coding memos to rationalize the revisions we made to the scheme. Together, we used the revised scheme for the thematic coding of all remaining data sets collected from three subsequent semesters (Transculturation Pedagogical Research Lab, 2019).

The grounded coding scheme includes twenty-five distinct thematic codes. We divided these thematic codes into broader categories that align with the two main learning outcomes of the curriculum, writing and intercultural learning skills. Because intercultural competence through our adopted definition and assessment methods is operationalized along three domains (cognitive, affective, and behavioral), we grouped thematic codes under these axial categories. Thematic codes like prior knowledge, stereotypes, cultural identity, attitude change, and cultural exposure are grouped under the cognitive domain, while codes like emotional response and empathy are grouped under the affective domain and codes like behavioral change and cultural interaction are classified under the behavioral domain. There were also thematic codes that match more than one domain. For example, thematic codes like curiosity, openness, and student aspirations are both cognitive and affective, while transfer is cognitive and behavioral. Another category was contextual conditions which included thematic codes like curricular conditions, classroom conditions, concurrent conditions, L2 learning, societal issues, Purdue experience, and multiculturalism in professions. The remaining thematic codes like writing skills, multimodal composition, and critical learning skills fall under FYW learning outcomes.

After completing the thematic coding of all reflective texts, we calculated the frequency of thematic codes each reflective text included. The frequency of occurrence is defined as the number of times a particular thematic code appeared out of the total number of active thematic codes in each reflective text. The active thematic codes relate to verbatim statements and the content each participant emphasized.

Due to the developmental nature of intercultural competence as a construct, we mapped all students' reflections onto the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) (Bennett, 1986) to understand larger-scale changes, or lack thereof, across the entire semester. The DMIS scale includes six stages of intercultural development, along a continuum from ***ethnocentric*** to ***ethnorelative*** orientations: denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration. Based on students' writing in reflective journals, we determined which developmental stage a student's intercultural sensitivity was at. We looked for significant verbatim statements from the raw data and interpreted them by referring to contextual cues in students' writing and past reflections of our own ethnographic experiences. To make mapping decisions, we matched these interpretations with the respective stage on the scale based on the definition and description of each stage provided by Bennett (2004). In the process, we negotiated our decisions and documented the criteria we considered by composing memo annotations which rationalized the choices we made. DMIS mapping was applied to the entire number of reflective texts from the pilot semester. Therefore, a participant's intercultural competence was assessed five times in total with reference to their four reflective journals and final course reflection. These results helped describe students' intercultural competence development over time. Some student reflections focused on writing skill development; thus, we could not map these reflections on the DMIS scale and labelled them "writing-based reflections."

5 | Results and Analysis

Analyzing students' reflective writing data offers a preliminary evaluation of curricular outcomes. We see three trends we plan to examine in subsequent data sets. The first trend is a prevalence of prior conditions as a thematic code in participants' first reflective task. Participants' interactional experiences with the curriculum triggered them to recall prior conditions related to the primary themes of focus in the interventions. In both the international and domestic pilot student samples (refer to Tables 3 & 4), "prior conditions" was generally the most prevalent code, except for International Student 7, whose most frequent thematic code in Journal 1 was "concurrent conditions."

"Insert Table 3 about here"
"Insert Table 4 about here"

This preliminary trend suggests the curricular interventions triggered participants to report on prior or concurrent experiences and connect them to their current learning. When participants considered both prior and current contexts as sources of knowledge about cultural difference and the new writing genres they are working with, they connected their classroom learning to multiple contexts, thus fostering a learning for transfer mindset. Even when participants have encountered prior interactional experiences with cultural difference, they were not necessarily capable of connecting between learning situations autonomously. As curriculum designers and teacher scholars, we situated reflective writing tasks purposefully within interventions, hoping to connect active exposure to difference through interventions and active interaction with difference via reflective practice. This purposeful design affords students the ability to building the schematic contexts that can serve as a bridge for transfer. But transfer of prior knowledge to new learning contexts and situations is neither natural, nor accidental; it is conscious and intuitive (DePalma & Ringer, 2011). To ease the challenges of such cognitive processes, we designed the curriculum to maximize

opportunities for application of prior knowledge in new learning contexts and application of new knowledge in concurrent learning situations. Students' use and reuse of prior and current knowledge in concurrent learning tasks within our curriculum (i.e., through reading activities, reflective writing, paired classroom lessons, research and writing tasks) suggests they would benefit from a stage for practicing transfer of learning before they even consider future applications. Unless future contexts of learning intentionally create further opportunities for transfer, some students could struggle with drawing such connections autonomously.

The second main trend is an increase in critical evaluation skills from Journal 1 to 4. Critical evaluation skills are defined in the grounded coding scheme as "interpretation, inference, synthesis, questioning, or analysis." The increase of critical evaluation skills (in Tables 5, 6, 7, & 8) parallels the advancement of participants on the DMIS scale, which aligns with Deardorff's (2006) argument about critical evaluation being an instrumental skill for building cultural competence. This parallel trend is generally prevalent among all participants, except for two students (domestic participant 4 and international participant 6). The DMIS mapping results also point toward the nature of intercultural competence as a *developmental construct* and the importance of an intervention's duration as a factor in the presence or lack of changes. For example, while domestic participant 1 (in Table 6) showed a steady increase in critical evaluation skills from journal 2 to 4, the thematic content of journals 2 through 4 consistently matched the adaptation stage. The latter may indicate participants need time to advance from one stage to the other, or that each stage of the scale could include a continuum of ***substages*** participants pass through before they make advancement to a subsequent stage.

It is also interesting that journals which could not be mapped on the DMIS scale included content about writing skills rather than cultural reflections. Moreover, several of these writing based reflective journals did not have instances of critical evaluation skills because participants described their experiences with the writing genres and skills in the classroom but did not analyze or evaluate such learning experiences. This observation has challenged us to think about reflective writing as a genre and how we could better teach it in writing classes. When students describe their experiences, but do not bolster the description of these experiences with an analytic and evaluative approach, reflections can lack critical evaluation. How could reflective practice be promoted in the writing classroom in ways that build a more well-rounded intercultural mindset and skillset? As indicated in few writing-based reflections, some students tend to recount an intercultural experience without critically evaluating and obtaining meaningful learning from it. Thus, we should seek ways to remind students of the different steps in writing an intercultural reflection. That is, effective reflection of cultural encounters is multi-layered, and description of the experience should be followed by analysis, evaluation, and interpretation.

"Insert Table 5 about here"
"Insert Table 6 about here"
"Insert Table 7 about here"
"Insert Table 8 about here"

The third trend we identified was discussion of writing skills in the final reflective essay. In the grounded coding scheme, "writing skills" is defined as "metadiscourse about summary, research, revision, analysis, and knowledge of genre conventions." Reflection about development in writing skills was more prevalent among international students. For domestic student participants, focus of the final reflection varied among writing skill development, curricular conditions, and their emotional response to curricular interventions (Table 9). In addition to writing skills, international student participants also focused on reflecting upon prior conditions and their emotional response to the interventions (Table 10). We define "emotional response" as "expressing emotions in response to a theme, course intervention, or an event from inside or outside the classroom." These primary focuses of the final reflective essays of the pilot data set could indicate participants were aware of the various aims of the curriculum and of the context of interventions built into the curriculum. Students' awareness of learning outcomes and the purpose of curricular interventions can help them engage more effectively in the classroom learning environment and develop language to use when reflecting upon their learning. Such language further enables them to communicate their progress to instructors interested in formative assessment, and in turn, helps instructors shape feedback accordingly.

"Insert Table 9 about here"
"Insert Table 10 about here"

Preliminary analysis of formative assessment data from reflective writing suggests our curriculum could help develop different indicators of intercultural competence in three domains of cognition, affect and behavior, as highlighted by several interculturalists (Deardorff, 2006). At the same time, we also noticed that different participants found various modes of engagement meaningful in their own development. And testimonials from reflective writing show participants connected curricular interventions with modes of engagement. For example, multicultural texts provided exposure to difference and introduced new concepts to students in a low-risk way. Structured intercultural interaction—while higher-risk—showcased cultural difference through live human interactions and cross-cultural negotiations. The alignment between increased critical evaluations skills and participants' advancement on the DMIS scale reflected how our curriculum could have potentiality for foregrounding intercultural competence in two main domains —cognition and behavior. The cognitive indicators of intercultural competence we targeted, such as cultural self-awareness, deep cultural knowledge, and sociolinguistic awareness (Deardorff, 2006) were foregrounded in interventions like the multicultural reader, classroom discussions about cultural themes, cross-cultural teamwork, and introspective reflection. The behavioral indicators of intercultural competence such as to listen, to observe, to evaluate, to analyze, to interpret and to relate cultural issues (Deardorff, 2006) were scaffolded and practiced through the strategic linking of reflective writing to various curricular interventions like readings, assignments, paired classroom activities, collaborative ethnographies, and individual research projects.

Because half of the participants in the pilot sample (Tables 9 & 10) engaged in emotional responses within the final reflective essay, we think affect—the third dimension of

intercultural competence, may be an influence (Deardorff, 2006). This finding also aligns with arguments in writing studies about the value of cross-cultural composition when it situates intercultural pedagogy in the context of writing curricula. Jordan (2005) argues it is necessary for students to write in order to "explore their own cultural affiliations, family backgrounds, and experiences with intercultural communication, even uncomfortable ones, so students may draw on their pre-classroom knowledge and continue to build for themselves the subjectivities that will encounter supposedly foreign texts they read" (p. 182). Most participants in the pilot sample (Tables 3 & 4) started their reflective writing with a discussion of prior experiences with diversity and prior knowledge about writing skills, which further relays how our curricular interventions activated students' cognitive capacities to connect learning between experiences and contexts. The curricular interventions further invited students to bring their lived curriculum to the classroom—perhaps because we created opportunities that enabled students to build bridges between prior and current learning.

6 | Conclusion

Integrating intercultural competence into undergraduate curricula promotes internationalization work at US institutions by facilitating meaningful interaction with the broad spectrum of differences international and domestic students bring to campus. This internationalization approach honors student cultural capital and promotes an asset-based model for inclusion of diverse student populations. Our pilot dataset results suggest that international and domestic students can develop intercultural competence when presented with purposeful interventions that improve their cognitive capacities, behavioral skills, and affective responsiveness to witness, comprehend, and interact with difference. Difference as an umbrella construct, enacted in our curriculum design, is inclusive of language, cultural, and identity markers, which supports our belief that an intercultural competence-based approach to internationalizing writing curricula is relevant for international and domestic students.

Our preliminary assessment of the curricular interventions indicates that building students' reflective and analytical skills enhances their development of intercultural competence. This parallel relationship is common to intercultural (Wilbur, 2016) and FYW scholarship. Developing analytical skills that enable connections among learning contexts facilitates building cultural knowledge. Curiosity, openness, and metacognition, requisites for intercultural competence development (Deardorff, 2006), are also identified by CWPA and NCTE as primary "habits of mind" that promote success in college writing (*Framework 5*). This may explain why our intercultural competence-based approach to internationalizing FYW curricula achieves dual purposes, i.e., developing both intercultural competence and writing skills. We hope that our FYW approach can serve as a model for writing programs keen on internationalizing their writing curricula with the affordances (campus diversity and writing curriculum design expertise) that exist within their campuses and programs. It bridges the gap between the increased diversity in student demographics on campus and the overall goal of promoting an inclusive education. Such interventions are especially relevant now due to the xenophobia towards racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious differences the US society continues to witness. Rose and Weiser (2018) invite writing programs to enact their "potential to teach and reinforce different values by recognizing and embracing linguistic, national, and cultural differences" (p. 16). We are responding to this call and thus invite other writing programs to revise their curricula in ways that foster student understanding of difference.

7| THE AUTHORS

Hadi Banat is an assistant professor of English and the ESL Program Director at UMass Boston. His published works focus on L2 writing assessment and pedagogy, tutor identity in writing centers, the internationalization of writing and ESL programs, and grant writing and constructive distributed work in collaborative research teams.

Rebekah Sims is a lecturer at the University of Strathclyde School of Education in Glasgow, UK. She specializes in practitioner research and teacher education, with a specific focus on implementing Culturally Responsive Teaching to increase inclusivity in both secondary and higher education.

Phuong Minh Tran is an assistant professor of Writing Studies in Higher Education at the University of Toronto, Mississauga. Her scholarly interests revolve around composition pedagogy, second language writing, translingual writing, and World Englishes. Phuong's current research focuses on designing multicultural readings for intercultural competence development.

Parva Panahi is a doctoral candidate in the Second Language Studies program at Purdue University where she also teaches first-year writing. Parva's scholarship centers around writing studies, and her research interests include the internationalization of writing programs, writing teacher education in the era of superdiversity, and culturally sustaining writing pedagogy.

Bradley Dilger is associate professor of English at Purdue, where he mentored and collaborated with Hadi, Rebekah, Phuong, and Parva to realize their vision for Transculturation in Introductory Composition. With Shelley Staples, he founded Crow, the Corpus & Repository of Writing. He studies writing transfer with Neil Baird.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the Center of Intercultural Learning Mentorship Assessment and Research (CILMAR) at Purdue University for their continuous funding of this research project as well the Council of Writing Program Administrators for granting this project an external research initiative grant.

REFERENCES

Baba, Y. & Hosoda, M. (2014). Home away home: Better understanding of the role of social support in predicting cross-cultural adjustment among international students. *College Student Journal, 48*(1), 1–15.

Baldassar, L. & McKenzie, L. (2016). Beyond "Just Being There": Teaching internationalization at home in two qualitative methods units. *Teaching Sociology, 44* (2), 84–95. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0092055X16631126

Beaufort, A. (2007). *College writing and beyond: A new framework for university writing instruction*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Bennett, J. M. & Bennett, M. J. (2004). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. In Dan Landis, Janet M. Bennett, and Milton J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of Intercultural Training* (p. 147–165). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*(2), 179–196. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(86)90005-2

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287002

Deardorff, D. K. (2011). Assessing intercultural competence. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 149,* 65–79. https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.381

DePalma, M. J., & Ringer, J. M. (2011). Toward a theory of adaptive transfer: Expanding disciplinary discussions of "transfer" in second-language writing and composition studies. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *20*(2), 134–147. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.02.003

Glass, C. R., & Westmont, C. M. (2014). Comparative effects of belongingness on the academic success and cross-cultural interactions of domestic and international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *38*, 106–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.04.004

Haan, J. (2018). Developing faculty for the multilingual writing classroom. In S.K. Rose & I. Weiser (Eds.) *The Internationalization of US Writing Programs* (p. 216–233). Louisville, CO: Utah State University Press.

Jones, E. & Killick, D. (2007). Internationalization of the curriculum. In E. Jones and S. Brown (Eds.) *Internationalizing Higher Education* (p. 109–119). London: Routledge.

Jordan, J. (2005). Rereading the multicultural reader: Toward more infectious practices in multicultural composition. *College English, 68*(2), 168–185. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/30044672

Kachru, B. B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes, 9*(1), 3-20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1990.tb00683.x

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*(1), 5–31. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832

Lee, A. (2017). *Teaching interculturally: A framework for integrating disciplinary knowledge and intercultural development*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Martins, D. S. (Ed.) (2015). *Transnational writing program administration*. Louisville, CO: Utah State University Press.

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

Nilsson, B. (2016). Internationalization at home from a Swedish perspective: The case of Malmo. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7*(1), 27–40.

O'Bryan, A. (March 2005). Cross-cultural Freshman composition. *Compleat Links, 2*(1). Retrieved from https://www.tesol.org/read-and-publish/journals/other-serial-publications/compleat-links/compleat-links-volume-2-issue-1-(march-2005)/cross-cultural-freshman-composition

Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession 91*, 33–40

Rose, S. K. & Weiser, I. (2018). *The Internationalization of US Writing Programs*. Louisville, CO: Utah State University Press.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Siczek, M. & Shapiro, S. (2014). Developing writing-intensive courses for a globalized curriculum through WAC-TESOL collaborations. In T. M. Zawacki and M. Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (p. 329-346). Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse & Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Transculturation Pedagogical Research Lab. (2019, July 24). *Research methods and assessment*. Retrieved from https://writeic.org/.

Wilbur, G. (2016). The staying power intercultural learning through reflective inquiry. *Reflective Practice*, *17*(1), 59–71. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2015.1123687

WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (3.0). (2014, July 17). Council of Writing Program Administrators. Retrieved from http://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/243055/_PARENT/layout_details/false

Yakunina, E., Weigold, I., Weigold, A., & Elsayed, N. (2013). International students' personal and multicultural strengths: Reducing acculturative stress and promoting adjustment. *Journal of Counselling and Adjustment, 91*(2), 216–223. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2013.00088.x

Yancey, K. B. (1998). *Reflection in the writing classroom*. Louisville, CO: Utah State University Press.

Table 1: Paired Class Meetings & Course Assignment Scaffolding

Paired Meeting	**Purpose**	**Goals**
Week 3	Cultural Interaction through Primary Research Ethics & Dynamics | **Assignment I**	Build familiarity between researchers & coordinate outside class meetings
Week 6	Cultural Exposure through Secondary Research | **Assignment II**	Validate & construct knowledge from source texts
Week 9	Framing Arguments through Cultural Source Texts | **Assignment II**	Mentor students to examine secondary research data for framing cultural arguments
Week 12	Remediating Cultural Content & Visual Rhetoric | **Assignment III**	Promote students' abilities to redesign cultural content for a different audience
Week 15	Reflective Practice | **Assignment IV**	Help students culminate their continuous reflections about writing and intercultural learning

Table 2: Participant Recruitment by Semester

Semester	**Recruited**	**Failed Screening**	**Withdrew**	**Total**
Spring 2017/ L2-Specific	4	0	0	4
Spring 2017/ Mainstream	4	0	0	4
Fall2017-2018/L2-Specific	13	0	0	13

Fall2017-2018/ Mainstream	9	1	0	8
Spring 2018/ L2-Specific – Set 1	9	0	0	9
Spring 2018/ Mainstream – Set 1	12	0	0	12
Spring 2018/ L2-Specific – Set 2	2	0	0	2
Spring 2018 / Mainstream – Set 2	6	0	0	6
Total	59	1	0	58

Recruited: Students who consented to participate in the study
Failed Screening: Students who did not complete all written course components
Withdrew: Students who withdrew their participation after signing the consent form

Table 3: Frequency of prior conditions code in Domestic Participants' First Reflective Task

Participant	**Frequency in Journal 1**
Domestic 1	21%
Domestic 2	19%
Domestic 3	10%
Domestic 4	19%

Table 4: Frequency of prior conditions code in International Participants' First Reflective Task

Participant	**Frequency in Journal 1**
International 5	33%
International 6	23%
International 7	3%
International 8	28%

Table 5: Frequency Increase in Domestic Participants' Critical Evaluation Skills from J1 to J4

Participant	**J1 - Week 3**	**J2 - Week 6**	**J3 - Week 9**	**J4 - Week 12**
Domestic 1	7%	18%	31%	45%
Domestic 2	0%	0%	5%	32%
Domestic 3	17%	35%	3%	30%
Domestic 4	8%	9%	31%	12%

Table 6: DMIS Scale Mapping of Domestic Participants' Reflective Writing

Participant	**J1 - Week 3**	**J2 - Week 6**	**J3 - Week 9**	**J4 - Week 12**
Domestic 1	Acceptance	Adaptation	Adaptation	Adaptation
Domestic 2	Acceptance	Writing Based	Writing Based	Adaptation
Domestic 3	Minimization	Minimization	Writing Based	Acceptance
Domestic 4	Denial	Minimization	Minimization	Acceptance

Table 7: Frequency Increase in International Participants' Critical Evaluation Skills from J1 to J4

Participant	**J1 - Week 3**	**J2 - Week 6**	**J3 - Week 9**	**J4 - Week 12**
International 5	0%	41%	49%	34%

International 6	0%	13%	32%	79%
International 7	20%	14%	0%	44%
International 8	3%	14%	14 %	0%

Table 8: DMIS Scale Mapping of International Participants' Reflective Writing

Participant	**J1 - Week 3**	**J2 - Week 6**	**J3 - Week 9**	**J4 - Week 12**
International 5	Denial	Polarization	Minimization	Acceptance
International 6	Denial	Denial	Denial	Denial
International 7	Acceptance	Minimization	Writing Based	Acceptance
International 8	Adaptation	Adaptation	Adaptation	Writing Based

Table 9: Most frequent Thematic Codes within the Domestic Participant Sample

Participant	**First Most Frequent Code**	**Second Most Frequent Code**
Domestic 1	Curricular Conditions (33%)	Writing Skills (22%)
Domestic 2	Cultural Identity (32%)	Emotional Response (12%)
Domestic 3	Curricular Conditions (33%)	Emotional Response (18%)
Domestic 4	Writing Skills (52%)	Curricular Conditions (16%)

Table 10: Most frequent Thematic Codes within the International Participant Sample

Participant	**First Most Frequent Code**	**Second Most Frequent Code**
International 5	Writing Skills (31%)	Prior Knowledge (17%)

International 6	Writing Skills (25%)	Emotional Response (19%)
International 7	Writing Skills (28%)	Emotional Response (15%)
International 8	Attitude Change (22%)	Prior Knowledge (17%) Writing Skills (17%)