THESIS

INSTRUCTOR AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF MAINSTREAM AND INTERNATIONAL-ONLY SECTIONS OF COLLEGE COMPOSITION

Submitted by

Kristina D. Yelinek

Department of English

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Spring 2014

Master's Committee:

Advisor: Tony Becker

Lisa Langstraat
Mica Glantz

ABSTRACT

INSTRUCTOR AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF MAINSTREAM AND INTERNATIONAL-ONLY SECTIONS OF COLLEGE COMPOSITION

Abstract: Research has shown that NNSE may face struggles in American college composition classrooms that NSE typically do not. These struggles can stem from differences between L1 and L2 writing, different cultural and classroom expectations, and instructors who may be unfamiliar with the difficulties that NNSE face. Because of these struggles, debate has arisen as to the best instructional setting for NNSE in composition programs. This study sought to explore and compare the experiences of international students in two instructional settings: 1) international-only sections and 2) mainstream classes. Mainstream instructor experiences were also explored and compared with international students' experiences. Experiences were explored using a mixed-method approach with surveys and interviews and may help identify why students chose a particular instructional setting. Instructor perceptions of international students' experiences contrasted from students' experiences in most areas explored. Results suggest that international students should consider whether they feel comfortable working with and being assessed alongside NSE when making their enrollment choice. Mainstream instructors should consider using more pair than group work and provide training in peer review when there are international students enrolled in their class. Finally, the composition program should consider providing additional training on working with L2 writers for instructors who are interested and explore the possibility of developing a "mixed" composition class.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research would not have been possible without the support of many people. Many thanks go to Tony Becker, my advisor, who read multiple drafts and provided many suggestions for organization. Also thanks to my committee members, Lisa Langstraat and Mica Glantz, who offered guidance and support. Additional thanks to Lisa Langstraat, as well as Sue Russell, for their willingness to explain the composition program placement process for international students. Thanks to my fellow CO150 instructors who provided me with insight into their experiences in teaching CO150 and who allowed me to come into their classes to talk with their students about my research. Thanks to the many students who took time out of their busy schedule to complete the survey and also be interviewed about their experiences in CO150. Thanks to the CSU English Department Composition Program who provided me with the opportunity to teach both the mainstream and international-only sections of CO150 so I could become curious about differences student experiences, which ultimately led to this research. And finally, thanks to my family and friends who supported me through this process.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my parents who have always supported me through every adventure I have undertaken and this one was no exception. I also dedicate this to my sister who was always willing to offer suggestions, advice, and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

DEDICATION iv

LIST OF TABLES viii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 6

Similarities and Differences between L1 and L2 Writers 6

Rhetorical Differences 9

Identification of Voice and Self 13

Classroom Expectations: Challenges for International Students 17

Classroom Participation 17

Peer-review 21

Conferencing 23

Expectations of Academic Honesty 26

Instructors' Perceptions of L2 Learners 30

Instructional Settings for Teaching Composition 36

International-Only Sections of Composition Classes 37

Mainstreaming 39

An Additional Choice: Mixed Composition Classes 41

Advocating Student Choice 42

Statement of Problem 44

CHAPTER 3: METHODS 47

Research Design....48
Context of the Study....48
Participants and Data Collection....50
International-only participants....52
Mainstream class participants....52
Instructor participants....53
Instruments....53
Analysis of Data....54
Quantitative analysis....55
Qualitative analysis....55
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION....57
Experiences of International Students in International-Only Sections....57
Choice of instructional setting....58
Perceived comfort level in the classroom....63
Fulfillment of needs....65
Preferred enrollment option....74
Experiences of International Students in Mainstream Classes....75
Choice of instructional setting....75
Perceived comfort level in the classroom....79
Fulfillment of needs....81
Preferred enrollment option....85
Comparison of Student Experiences....86
Experiences of Mainstream Instructors....92

Perceived comfort level in the classroom 92
Fulfillment of student needs 96
Benefits/Challenges of instructing international students 100
Perceptions of placement options 102
Level of support for instructors 103
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS 106
Limitations 106
Implications 107
Areas for Further Research 109
REFERENCES 110
APPENDIX A: SURVEY FOR MAINSTREAMED INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS 116
APPENDIX B: SURVEY FOR INTERNATIONAL-ONLY SECTION STUDENTS 118
APPENDIX C: SURVEY FOR MAINSTREAM INSTRUCTOR WITH INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS 120
APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR STUDENTS 122
APPENDIX E: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR INSTRUCTORS 123

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: International-Only Section Student Language Backgrounds. 52

Table 2: Mainstream International student Language backgrounds 53

Table 3: Reasons for Enrollment in International-Only Sections 58

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Select Survey Questions Relating to Comfort Level in the Classroom 64

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Select Survey Questions Relating to Perception of Needs Fulfillment.....66

Table 6: Reasons for Enrollment in Mainstream Sections.....75

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Select Survey Questions Relating to Comfort Level in the Classroom 80

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics for Select Survey Questions Relating to Fulfillment of Needs.....82

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for Select Survey Questions on Perceptions of International Students' Comfort Level.....93

Table 10: Descriptive Statics for Select Survey Questions Related to Perceptions of Needs Fulfillment.....96

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

International students entering college composition classes come from a variety of backgrounds. Most of these students enter university either directly from their home country or after first enrolling in Intensive English Programs (IEPs). Because students may have different educational experiences before enrolling in university classes, "the educational background differences among second-language students in ESL writing classrooms can be especially diverse" (Reid, 2006, p. 76). As a result, international students in writing classrooms can vary considerably in terms of their language proficiency, writing ability, and classroom expectations.

Composition classes are a common requirement of U.S. universities for both international and non-international students. The U.S. composition classroom may pose problems for some international students as many composition instructors observe that international students may not have the language skills necessary for writing in an academic context, leaving instructors uncertain about the place of language instruction in the composition classroom (Coxhead & Byrd, 2007). International students may also have additional issues when it comes to writing in English that go beyond linguistic difficulties. One reason international students may find themselves unprepared for the college writing classroom is that high scores (80 or above) on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) "do not necessarily imply writing expertise" (Angelova & Riazantseva, 1999, p. 521), but instead may simply indicate an understanding of the English language. As a result, additional instruction in writing conventions for an American academic setting may be necessary for many international students.

Another reason for international students' struggles in composition classes may be due to differences in writing instruction and expectations of an ESL writing class, either in their home country or at IEPs in the U.S., and the instructional methods and expectations of a college

composition class. Non-native speakers of English (NNSE) may find that what they learned in their IEP doesn't necessarily conform to what they are expected to produce in the college composition classroom. For example, writing a five paragraph essay is often taught in many ESL classes and IEPs, but is often rejected in college composition classes as these classes strive to teach students more sophisticated ways of presenting their ideas (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995). As international students enter college composition classrooms, they are faced both with language challenges as well as composition skill challenges. For example, international students may struggle with different forms of words. They are often comfortable using the base forms of verbs that occur frequently in academic writing, but may be less familiar with the inflectional forms; these inflectional forms can occur more often in academic writing than the base form, causing international students to struggle with academic writing (Coxhead & Byrd, 2007). Additionally, international students may find it difficult to organize their ideas in a way that is consistent with American expectations of essay structure and organization (Matsuda, 2006a). As a result, composition programs may find that international students are faced with challenges and needs that differ from the writing needs of native speakers of English (NSE).

Unfortunately, many universities do not have the resources available to provide separate writing instruction for international students and therefore, international students are often placed in classes with NSE. Other universities provide separate composition classes for L2 writers, which may address some of their specific needs as language learners, but may put them at a disadvantage later when they enter mainstream university classes where they must then work with and compete with NSE.

As more and more international students enter U.S. universities, English departments must decide where to place international students in composition classrooms. Traditionally,

NNSE are typically placed in one of three composition class options: 1) classes with NSE, called "mainstreaming"; 2) developmental writing classes; or 3) international-only composition classes. Part of the challenge in placement faced by university English departments has to do with the difference in writing styles, strategies, and complexity of L2 writers when compared to L1 writers. When international students are enrolled in classes with NSE, they may not receive the kind of instruction necessary to address the specific language and composition challenges they face. Also, if time is taken to address these issues, NSE may find this kind of instruction unnecessary and even be offended by this type of instruction. In addition, some international students may resent being placed in developmental writing classes or international-only sections, believing that these sections may be too easy and will not help them adequately develop their academic writing skills. Finally, many instructors of mainstream composition courses may not have experience working with international students and face the challenge of working with students who are writing in a language other than their native tongue.

Instructors in mainstream or developmental classes may find that they are unaware of the struggles specific to international students. As Leki (1992) points out, "teaching writing to ESL students is not radically different from teaching writing to native English speakers (…) but ESL students *are* different from native students, and in ways not necessarily predictable (...)" (italics added for emphasis) (p. xi). International students often produce writing that is less fluent than NSE writers, may struggle with content development, and contain errors that NSE writing typically does not.

The placement of international students may also have negative consequences for the assessment of their writing. Instructors may be biased when it comes to the evaluation of international students' writing, although they may not be aware of their biases. They may expect

that international students who are enrolled in college-level courses should have writing that is equivalent or nearly equivalent to that of NSE enrolled in the same courses and may assess NNSE lower than NSE based on that assumption (Matsuda, 2006a). Placement in international-only composition classes may address, or at least mitigate, some of these issues.

Matsuda (1999), in his review of the history of composition classes and treatment of international students in those classes, points out that even if students enroll in ESL writing courses prior to enrolling in college composition classes, "the unique difficulties that ESL writers encounter (…) are not likely to disappear completely after a semester (…) of additional language instruction" and that students "may not be familiar with the culturally constructed values and expectations" of the American English composition classroom (p. 715). Matsuda (2006a) further argues that the current state of the college composition classroom assumes that all students "are native English speakers by default" and that instructors may be "unprepared for second-language writers who enroll in mainstream composition courses" (p. 637). Mainstream composition instructors may be at a loss of how to deal with the specific challenges of L2 writers or may not even be aware that problems exist, placing international students at a disadvantage in comparison to their native speaker counterparts.

Because international students often have different needs in a composition classroom as compared to NSE writers, a debate has emerged as to the type of instructional setting that may be most beneficial for international students. Some argue that mainstream classes are a good option because they can provide benefits to both NNSE as well as NSE, such as authentic language exposure for NNSE and cross-cultural learning for both groups (Healy & Hall, 1994; Matsuda & Silva, 1999). Most research, however, suggests that international student-specific writing and classroom needs can best be addressed in a composition class composed of only international

students with an instructor who is knowledgeable on the types of struggles faced by NNSE. In addition to specific studies that have identified the benefits and drawbacks to mainstream versus international-only composition classes, other studies have identified differences and struggles of international and ESL students in both content and composition classes.

As more international students enter institutions of higher education in the U.S., they may find themselves struggling to understand the expectations and requirements of this context. One area that may be particularly challenging is in regard to writing for an American academic audience. Since most universities require all students to show proficiency in writing, international students will most likely receive some type of instruction into writing at the university level. Many U.S. university composition programs, like the one in the present study, offer a choice of instructional settings for international students, allowing them to enroll in either mainstream composition classes or international-only sections.

The present study has two main purposes. The first is to compare the two instructional settings offered to international students regarding international students' experiences and perceptions of their placement choice in order to determine the similarities and differences of their experiences. The second purpose is to explore the experiences of instructors of mainstream classes who have international students in their classes and then compare their experiences and perceptions with those of the international students enrolled in mainstream classes. By exploring and comparing these experiences, advisors of international students as well as faculty and instructors in the composition program may be able to suggest the instructional setting most appropriate for individual students as well as determine any areas of concern that may need addressing in order to improve the experiences of international students or instructors.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to understand the different opinions as to the best placement option for international students in composition classes, it is important to first understand some of the differences between NSE and NNSE in the classroom setting, both in the composition classroom as well as mainstream classroom. These differences are not only related to the challenges L2 writers face when writing in a second language, but are also related to cultural differences and expectations of the American classroom as well as to the level of comfort an international student may feel in a classroom with other international students as compared to a classroom with mostly NSE. The background and experiences of instructors can also affect the experience of an international student in the classroom, and raters' experience with L2 writing can influence how they assess L2 writing compared to writing by NSE. By exploring the challenges that international students face in the U.S. classroom, the benefits and drawbacks of the different placement options for the composition classroom can be more fully understood.

Similarities and Differences between L1 and L2 Writers

Some of the debate as to the type of instruction that is most beneficial to international students in composition classes concerns the unique writing challenges faced by NNSE as compared to NSE. While most L2 writing research has focused on differences, which represents the bulk of this section, there are some similarities in specific parts of the writing process between NNSE and NSE. For example, Cumming (1989) examined the writing of NNSE to determine the relationship that L1 writing expertise and English proficiency may have on L2 writing. Cumming was interested in how expertise and proficiency might interact to affect the quality of L2 writing as well as how they affected the writing process of L2 writers. In the study, students (n=23) completed three separate writing tasks: a letter, an expository argument, and a

summary. The students were categorized into three levels of writing ability in their L1 (French), based on a holistic score on a writing task in French, and two levels of proficiency in their L2 (English), established from test scores on an oral interview performed by the ESL faculty. To determine how L1 writing ability and L2 proficiency affected L2 writing, Cumming examined text quality, attention given to decision making during composition, and problem-solving behavior during the writing process.

Cumming's (1989) results showed that those students who had both higher L1 writing ability and L2 language proficiency were rated higher on the three writing tasks with regard to content, discourse organization, and language use. Although both factors (L1 writing ability and L2 proficiency) accounted for a large proportion of the variance, as indicated by repeat measures Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), they were shown to account for separate parts of the variance, with no significant interactions between the two factors. L1 writing proficiency was shown to be related to the quality of the organization and content included, problem solving skills, and attention paid to "complex aspects of writing while making decisions" (Cumming, 1989, p. 119). L2 proficiency was shown to have an "additive" effect in that it improved the quality of the writing produced, but did not affect the composition process. Cumming (1989) ultimately concluded that "the behaviors that expert writers displayed in their second language performance are consistent with the findings about expert writers' performance in their mother-tongue" (p. 119). He argues that these findings suggest that writing instruction for NNSE should focus on strategies that develop writing expertise as well as provide language instruction to improve L2 proficiency. For the composition classroom, this suggests that international students would mostly likely benefit from receiving both language instruction that targets problem areas as well as instruction on composition.

While Cumming's (1989) study represents one of the few studies that identified similarities between NNSEs' and NSEs' writing, most of the research has pointed out the differences. Silva (1993), in a review of 72 research reports on L1 compared to L2 writing, found that there were a number of salient differences between the writing of NNSE and NSE. For example, he reported that NNSE writers tend to do less planning, have more trouble organizing material, and take longer to actually produce written text than their NSE counterparts. With regard to the written texts produced by NNSE, Silva's (1993) review found that NNSE writing was less fluent, shorter, had more errors, and was holistically scored lower than NSE writers. He also identified that NNSE tend to provide less support in their argument structure than do NSE. This last point is particularly important because argument writing tends to be a typical expectation in academic writing and NNSE may require additional support and instruction when learning to write in this specific genre that NSE may not need.

Silva's (1993) review identified some of the unique challenges that may face NNSE writers. Although these are trends that have been identified, this is not to say that all international students share the same challenges. Silva (1997) points out that many of the "limitations" of NNSE writers are "developmental; that is, they exist because these writers are still learning English" (p. 210). As international students enroll in composition classes, their writing skills in English are still developing. With proper time and instruction, it is likely that these "limitations" may lessen or disappear altogether.

As American universities continue to hold students to increasingly higher standards of writing proficiency, L2 writers may find it difficult to keep up with NSE, as well as reach these high standards in the course of one semester. Angelova and Riazantseva (1999) argue that,

> Holding international students to the same stringent writing standards as their English-speaking counterparts (…) places them at a severe disadvantage because research in first-language and second-language writing indicates salient differences between the two in terms of both composing processes and text produced. (p. 492)

Recognition of the unique challenges faced by L2 writers, such as lack of experience with argument writing, frequent linguistic errors, and fluency issues, may help make international students more successful in the composition classroom. In international-only composition classes, these challenges can be addressed in ways they probably couldn't be addressed in mainstream classes. In addition to the linguistic challenges international students may face, the way essays are organized may also be problematic, as research has shown that language and culture can shape certain rhetorical features in writing.

Rhetorical Differences

The ways in which a writer attempts to inform, motivate, or persuade his/her audience, termed *rhetoric*, can be accomplished using different strategies, organizational patterns, and language (Ramage, Bean, & Johnson, 2012); these features may vary depending on the language or culture of the writer. Conforming to the rhetorical style most associated with an American academic context may prove difficult for international students without proper, specific instruction on what the expectations are in American academic writing.

Differences in rhetorical features and organizational patterns were first identified by Kaplan's (1966) paper on Contrastive Rhetoric, the way in which a writer's L1 and culture influence their writing; these influences may be especially noticeable when writing in an L2, as the organizational patterns may differ between cultures, bringing attention to these differences. Prior to Kaplan's (1966) discussion, much of the focus of language learning had been on spoken

language rather than written production and on language at the sentence level, rather than on a larger scale. Kaplan began to look at written language at the paragraph level and the effect a specific language background and thought pattern may have on the organization of a paragraph in that language.

Kaplan (1966) examined 600 compositions from distinct language backgrounds in order to determine whether different rhetorical patterns exist between the language groups. Kaplan identified English writing structure as linear; paragraphs begin with a topic sentence and the rest of the ideas in the paragraph are related to that topic sentence. In contrast, Kaplan identified that Arabic writers tend to employ a parallel structure when writing, often employing the use of coordinating conjunctions. Asian writing tends to use what Kaplan termed "indirection" where the topic is discussed from different perspectives, but is never addressed explicitly. He also identified that Romance languages, and to a lesser extent Russian, tend to include digressions in their discussion of a topic that may be interesting to the reader, but not necessarily directly related to the topic being discussed. Without instruction on these differences in rhetorical organizational patterns, international students will most likely not realize that the organization of their writing may "violate the expectations of the native reader" (Kaplan, 1966, p. 13). This "violation" may place international students at a disadvantage in the U.S. composition classroom in comparison to their NSE counterparts as instructors will probably expect student texts to conform to the English linear pattern as identified by Kaplan.

Popular throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s, Kaplan's original concept of Contrastive Rhetoric has since been critiqued and revised. One criticism of his early work was that it appeared to "privilege the writing of native English speakers," particularly because it seemed to compare other rhetorical styles of writing to the linear pattern of writing in English,

and seemed to dismiss differences between related languages and cultures (Connor, 2002, p. 494). In addition to this criticism, further comparisons of writing between different language backgrounds included a discussion of the expected role of the reader and writer in composition. Some rhetorical styles were identified as being "reader responsible," where the reader typically has to interpret meaning and understanding from the text, while other styles were identified as "writer responsible," where the writer must make connections and lead the reader to conclusions (Hinds, 1987). Despite these criticisms and revisions, Kaplan's initial identification of differences in writing patterns paved the way for a change in the way in which writing was taught in the ESL/EFL context. Specifically, Contrastive Rhetoric has led to an understanding of the role of culture in writing as well as leading to an identification of the different styles of writing employed in English for Specific Purposes.

As the ideas and methodologies for examining differences in texts have continued, Contrastive Rhetoric has given way to Intercultural Rhetoric, which moves away from simply identifying paragraph organization of Kaplan's (1966) original research and begins to examine writing in a number of different genres and contexts (Connor, 2004). Intercultural Rhetoric has led to a number of different types of writing being taught in IEPs, such as research reports, research articles, and grant proposals, in addition to the typical college essay; other types of writing are also being taught in English programs, such as business English (Connor, 2004). Finally, research has begun to focus on how writing functions as a social act and how texts construct meaning within certain contexts.

A case study of four international graduate students learning to write for an American academic discourse community illustrates some of the rhetorical difficulties students may encounter in learning to write for an American academic audience. Angelova and Riazantseva

(1999) were interested in identifying how international students learned the language specific to their chosen discipline, what difficulties they experienced in the process, and how those difficulties might be minimized. They followed four graduate students from three different language backgrounds (Indonesian, Taiwanese, and Russian) during their first year in graduate school. Through interviews, observations, and journals, all four students expressed frustration and difficulty in conforming to the rhetorical style of U.S. academic writing. Specifically, one of the Russian students mentioned that the American style of writing was more rational and concrete, whereas in Russian, he could "wander" more with his ideas. The Taiwanese student identified the more involved nature of the reader in Taiwanese writing, where the reader was expected to infer information, whereas American academic prose required more direct explanation for the reader. Some composition instructors may not be aware of the struggles international students encounter in learning to write in a different organization pattern. However, Angelova and Riazantseva (1999) identified that some instructors who are aware of these difficulties may not be aware of how to address them in ways that are beneficial to the students. Specifically, in the composition classroom, instructors may need explicit training or instruction on how to approach and help students with these difficulties.

Mainstream composition instructors may not be prepared to provide specific instruction on these differences between cultures, and certainly this would not be needed by the NSE writers in the class; however, without specific instruction on English writing patterns and structure, international students may be at a disadvantage when compared to their NSE counterparts who are already familiar with these cultural expectations of writing. International-only sections of a composition class can provide specific instruction on these expectations so that international students may be able to identify how their writing differs from the typical organizational patterns

in English and modify their writing so that it is more appropriate for an American academic audience.

Identification of Voice and Self

In addition to differences in rhetorical organizational patterns, the way in which the writer's voice, and as a result, self are represented in writing may differ between cultures and language backgrounds. Ramanathan and Atkinson (2006) identify voice as a person's "private and isolated inner selves, which […] give outward expression to thoughts through the use of a metaphorical 'voice'" (p.161). That is, voice in writing is the outward manifestation of how a writer thinks about an idea or concept and is reflected by the individual style of writing of the author. Voice is in turn, closely related to the identity of self, or how the writer views oneself in relation to others. In American academic writing, the writer's voice should often include an identification of self, at the individual level, with an incorporation of the writer's thoughts and opinions that is appropriate with the way in which the idea of the self is expressed in American culture.

Ramanathan and Atkinson (2006) provide evidence from a review of various studies that different cultures provide socialization of the "self" in very different ways, which are then reflected in the way the self is portrayed and used in writing. American middle class children are taught that individualism is important and that they have the right to voice their own opinions and views. In contrast, Chinese children may be taught that they are individuals, but that they must work as part of a group, working together and learning interdependency and "becoming oneself in relation to significant others" (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996, as cited in Ramanathan and Atkinson, 2006, p. 77). American writers, as a result, will most likely be prepared to include their opinions and views in writing, whereas Chinese writers are more likely to include the ideas and

opinions of others or let the reader form their own opinions rather than expressing their own individual views and ideas directly in their writing.

Because of these differences in the identity of the self in relations to others, in some cultures writing should distance the writer from ideas and concepts by attributing them to others and by using the pronoun "we", while in other cultures, it is more appropriate to use "I" and make personal claims to the information and ideas that are presented in writing. As Ramanathan and Atkinson (2006) state, "if it is true that the notion of the individual varies substantially across cultures, (…) then a concept of written voice that centrally assumes the expression of a 'unique inner self' may be problematic" for those NNSE whose identification of the self differs from the L2 writing situation (p. 82). Moving from writing in an L1 background that does not emphasize "self" in writing to an L2 that does may be difficult for students and will affect the voice, or style, of their writing; their style of writing, then, may be very different from the writing that is expected by the instructors of college courses in the U.S.

Because American society values individualism and the right to express one's own opinion and ideas, Ramanathan and Atkinson (2006) argue that the identification of self in the voice of a writer in American writing is typically expected to be reflected in writing. Ramanathan and Atkinson (2006) argue that asking international students to write with a voice that includes an idea of the self can cause difficulties for them in the composition classroom, since they would be expected to write with an American identification of self.

Atkinson and Ramanathan (2006) provided evidence from studies that these differences in the identity of self were traced to difficulties for international students to write with the process approach, an approach often used in the American composition classroom. For example, Chinese students found the process approach to writing particularly difficult because, unlike

American students, they were not writing to express themselves, but to be included as part of the community in which they were writing. The process approach asked them to write as an individual, rather than as a community, which they found difficult to do. Another study reviewed by Ramanathan and Atkinson (2006) found that Chinese writers, learning to write in English, believed that imitation was an important strategy for learning to write well in English since they were writing to be incorporated into the group. These types of strategies for writing in English may have ramifications beyond simple difficulties in writing, such as accusations of plagiarism if a student's imitation of a sample of writing they have found is too close to the original.

Many of the studies reviewed by Ramanathan and Atkinson (2006) were from the perspective of Chinese students and the difficulties they encountered. These difficulties have been explored in more detail in other studies, but the one that is most often cited is Shen's (1989) description of his transformation from a Chinese view of writing to a more American style of writing. As he described it, he had to discover who his "Western" or American self was and begin to see himself in relation to the world around him according to the American view of self. Part of this transformation required Shen to see himself more as an authority figure in his writing; Shen found that as he slowly began to use "I" more in his composition papers, he began to feel more comfortable with the American sense of voice and self in writing.

Shen's (1989) account of his transformation supports an important point raised by Ramanathan and Atkinson (2006); that is, learning to write with a different voice and style can take time. Composition classes may be able to make students aware of these differences, but as students enroll in higher education in the U.S., the time it takes to change their style is certainly something that bears consideration. Because it can take some time to adjust to the rhetorical expectations of American writing, some have raised the question of whether it's appropriate to

hold international students to the same standards of American academic discourse or whether they should be free to write in a way that is compatible with the writing appropriate to their linguistic and cultural background.

Angelova and Riazantseva (1999) argue that this becomes an important issue when considering the reasons for students' enrollment in American universities. Some students plan to stay in the U.S. upon completion of their degree and should therefore learn to write in a manner that is consistent with American academic discourse standards and expectations. However, many international students do not plan to stay in the U.S. and instead plan to return to their home country once they have received their degree. Writing in a manner that is consistent with the expectations of an American discourse community will most likely allow them to be successful in American classrooms. However, a change in their writing may then cause problems for them once they return to their home country. Students who plan to return to their home country may have little use for an American style of writing if they are writing for others in their country who employ a different organizational pattern than the typical English linear pattern. Additionally, it may impact the structure of their writing when they return to their home country so that they may face some of the same problems they faced when learning to write with an English rhetorical style.

Differences in the rhetorical expectations of an American academic audience in terms of organization and expression of voice are not the only struggles international students may face in the classroom. International students may also face challenges that are unrelated to writing. Certain classroom expectations, often based on culture, may present problems for international students, and have been identified not only in the composition classroom, but in the content classroom as well.

Classroom Expectations: Challenges for International Students

Underlying classroom assumptions may pose challenges for international students. There are certain "pedagogical concepts and practices emanating from the teaching of L1 writing [that] assume culturally specific norms of thought and expression which non-mainstream writers of English may have little social training in and thus [have] real difficulty accessing" (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 2006, p.160). These expectations extend beyond the composition classroom, as many studies have shown. Instructor expectations in a U.S. college classroom often include that students are aware of and have knowledge of "'American'—or at least a 'Western'—way of life" (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995, p. 558). Composition classes often ask students to write on and discuss current topics; international students may not have the knowledge of current events that their NSE counterparts are aware of, putting NNSE writers at a disadvantage (Braine, 1994a). International students may not be comfortable working with American students or speaking up in class, which can cause them to remain silent in class as well as during small group discussions or activities. Additionally, international students may not be comfortable with some of the expectations of academic writing, specifically criticizing others' writing, which may make peer review activities difficult. Finally, understanding, or misunderstanding, of what constitutes plagiarism in the U.S. can also pose challenges for international students. By placing international students in separate sections, these topics may be addressed in ways not possible in mainstream classes.

Classroom Participation

One challenge international students face in mainstream classes relates to the level of comfort they may have in working with and interacting with NSE in the class. Several studies have suggested that international students may find it difficult or are uncomfortable interacting

with American students individually as well as in groups. Composition classes often use group work as well as peer review activities during class. Few in education, especially in language learning, question the benefits of group work; within the composition classroom, many believe that group work results in "a wider range of rhetorical functions being used and promotes a positive affective environment" (Gibbons, 2006, p.57). If international students, however, do not feel comfortable in these situations and are not involved in these organized group activities, then they may not receive the same benefits that American students do from these activities.

In an early study conducted by Braine (1996), it was observed that international students struggled to participate in mainstream composition classes. He reported that international students wanted "to participate actively in discussions (and) wanted to be encouraged and drawn out by their teachers," but they didn't feel comfortable doing so in mainstream classes (p. 100). This type of behavior, however, changed in ESL composition classrooms. Instructors observed that students who were quiet and didn't participate in mainstream classes started to actively participate in activities with other students when they were enrolled in ESL composition classes (Braine, 1996).

A later study also reported the same insecurity on the part of international students when working with American students. Ibrahim and Penfield (2005) in their study of a mixed composition classroom (a mixture of NNSE and NSE) identified that some international students found ways of avoiding working with American students because they felt uncomfortable working with them. Some international students would arrive early to class so they could sit next to other international students, thereby lessening the chance they would have to work with an American student. One student in Ibrahim and Penfield's (2005) study stated that he was insecure in his English language abilities and that caused him to be afraid to talk in class, thereby

reducing his chances to improve his communicative abilities. Like the student in this study, many international students in mainstream classes often remain silent during class and don't participate in discussions with other students or their instructors.

Several studies have sought to determine the reasons behind the lack of participation of some international students. One such study followed a Chinese student through her university classes. Hsieh (2007) gathered information on the student's experiences, particularly her silence in classes, through semi-structured interviews throughout the semester. In this study, the female Chinese student expressed her frustration at the lack of interaction with her American classmates; she stated that they basically ignored her and therefore she didn't contribute much to class. This became a self-perpetuating cycle, whereby she felt that her silence made others see her as stupid and therefore she remained silent in her classes so as not to confirm the assumed opinion of her peers. Additional analysis of her narratives indicated that this student remained silent partly because of her personality, but also partly because she was "silenced by her American classmates" (Hsieh, 2007, p. 384). Hsieh (2007) argues that part of the experiences of the Chinese student could have been mitigated in several ways, including recognition on the part of instructors of the power difference between American and international students and assigning specific roles during group work so that each student is required and expected to contribute in some way.

An additional study examined the differences in interaction and participation of ESL students between ESL classes and mainstream classes. In Harklau's (1994) often cited three and half year ethnographic study of four Chinese students' transition from ESL to mainstream classes in a high school in California, she documented their experiences both in mainstream classrooms as well as ESL classrooms. In addition to their language learning experiences, Harklau

documented the students' interactions within their mainstream classrooms. She noted that "perhaps the single most salient aspect of observations of ESL students in mainstream classes was their reticence and lack of interaction with native-speaking peers" (p. 262-3). She noted that even when students were placed in groups with a specific job to perform, they often remained quiet and frequently left the groups after a few minutes to return to their desks to work on their own. This type of silence and lack of interaction echoes what was observed in Hsieh's (2007) study in a university setting, indicating that this type of behavior on the part of international students may happen in many different educational settings.

Harklau (1994) identified several reasons for the lack of interaction between the international students and American students. First, students expressed embarrassment with their English ability that caused them to retreat from interacting with native-speaking peers. Secondly, the students said that since they didn't share pop culture knowledge with their American counterparts, conversations were typically limited to school-related topics, limiting their interactions. Finally, there were tensions between different ethnic groups at this particular school that limited interaction.

Harklau (1994) contrasted the lack of interaction in mainstream classes with her observations of the interactions of the same students in ESL classes, determining that ESL classes perform an important role in the experiences of ESL students. She noted that "the importance of ESL to students' social life and interaction at school was evident in observations, where long hours of silence and impassivity in mainstream classes suddenly turned to noisy animation in ESL" (p. 265). These differences in willingness to participate and contribute in class are similar to the differences observed between mainstream composition classes and ESL composition classes in Braine's (1994b) study. Harklau also observed that students tended to

form lasting friendships in the ESL classes because "only these students (…) knew what students had left behind, and what they were going through at school, at home, and in U.S. society" (p. 266). Harklau ultimately believed that the ESL classes were a valuable part of the students' school experiences, affording them a place to form social connections as they made the transition to U.S. society. As international students make the transition to life in the U.S., international-only sections of composition may afford them the same type of experience and connections with other international students.

Peer-review. In addition to challenges in class participation, international students may also find peer-review challenging. Peer-review has been used heavily within the American composition classroom as a way to increase motivation for revision as well as encourage participation; however, it may often be difficult for international students. Ramanathan and Atkinson (2006) provide an overview of some of the difficulties faced by international students when presented with the practice of peer-review. Students from specific language backgrounds or cultures may find peer-review especially challenging. Students from Japan are one example Ramanathan and Atkinson (2006) include; they report that Japanese students may find it difficult to provide true criticism of a peer's work because their culture is so heavily rooted in "norms of politeness" (p. 171). It would be impolite for them to critique someone else's work and therefore they find peer-review challenging. Additionally, Ramanathan and Atkinson (2006) show that Chinese and Taiwanese students may also have difficulty in critiquing others' work because they don't feel that they have the authority to provide this type of feedback. Awareness of these differences in cultures and the resulting difficulties in peer-review are important things for composition instructors to consider. If an international student is paired with a NSE during peer-review, they may both find the activity difficult, with neither one of them receiving the type of

feedback that is expected in this type of interaction. Composition instructors may consider giving guided practice to NNSE and NSE students so that they may begin to feel comfortable with the activity.

Research into peer response has often focused either on L1 peer response groups exclusively or L2 groups exclusively. However, one case study looked at the interaction of L1 and L2 students in a mixed language background composition class. Zhu (2006) examined three peer response groups composed of three to four students each; all of the groups contained one NNSE and the rest of the group members were NSE. The study focused on turn-taking behavior, function of utterances during response, and similarities/differences between NNSE and NSE with regard to their comments on group members' writing. Zhu (2006) divided interactions into two categories: those utterances made by the participants as readers (providing feedback on others' writing) and as writers (receiving feedback on their own writing). Zhu (2006) identified similarities as well as differences between NNSE and NSE with regard to their roles as readers and writers. As readers responding to others' work, NNSE found it difficult to regain or maintain their turn; however, they gave similar amounts of oral feedback when compared to NSE. As writers, NNSE gave responses to feedback that they had received, but "did not clarify their writing for the readers" and they took fewer turns than NSE (p. 203). Neither the NNSE nor the NSE were successful at eliciting feedback from group members in the role as writer. Zhu (2006) maintains that these results have consequences for NNSE within the composition class and questions in what ways composition instructors might be able to ensure that NNSE are receiving the same level of benefits as NSE during peer-review. If NNSE are unable to receive the same benefits as NSE, they may not be able to revise their papers in a way that improves their writing. In turn, this may contribute to the lower scoring of their writing when compared to NSE as

identified in other studies (e.g. Silva, 1993). By providing examples of how to clarify writing or providing specific time allowances for each student to discuss their or others' writing, instructors may be able to mitigate some of the difficulties NNSE face in peer-review activities.

Conferencing. An additional type of interaction that can have an effect on student performance in writing is conferencing with their instructor. Conferencing is a widely recommended way of improving student writing in composition. Zamel (1985) found that student-teacher conferences were important for NNSE because these students often misunderstood written comments on their assignments; speaking with the instructor allowed for more clarification of these comments for the students. A study by Goldstein and Conrad (1990) of students in an advanced ESL composition class, however, showed that conferencing alone was not enough for student improvement and that in order for students to qualitatively improve their texts based on student-teacher conferences, NNSE writers must engage in negotiation of meaning. This same study showed that negotiation of meaning between teacher and student of the subsequent revision ensured that "revisions were almost always successful" (p.452). In this case, composition instructors may need to be aware of and help NNSE writers implement successful strategies during student-teacher conferences in order to increase the likelihood that a revision will be successful, which they may not need to do in conferences with NSE writers.

One study into the efficacy of writing conferences with L2 writers examined the relationship between writing proficiency of L2 writers and types of interactions during writing conferences with course instructors as well as whether students chose to incorporate teacher suggestions into their final papers (Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997). Students were from a large U.S. university enrolled in either a basic composition class or a more specific business writing class; six L2 writers, two L1 writers (four considered lower in their writing proficiency and in

jeopardy of failing their writing class and four high proficiency writers), and four writing instructors were included in the study. Patthey-Chavez and Ferris (1997) looked specifically at teacher requests for clarification and elaboration and teacher responses to argument structure, often with respects to anticipation and address of counterarguments. In order to determine how effective teacher writing conferences were, Patthey-Chavez and Ferris (1997) examined student rough first drafts, transcripts of student-teacher conferences about student rough drafts, the revised draft, as well as the first draft of the following assignment.

Results showed that conferences lasted almost twice as long with more proficient writers, regardless of L1 or L2 status, with more proficient students speaking more in conferences than weaker students. The teachers spoke more in conferences with weaker students than with more proficient students. Patthey-Chavez and Ferris (1997) also found that in addition to speaking less, weaker students also initiated conversation less during the conferences and relied on back-channeling (e.g. *uh-huh, okay, right*) for much of their interaction. With regard to revisions, weaker students tended to include most of the teacher's recommendations, frequently word for word. Stronger students also included teacher suggestions; however, they often rethought the ideas and presented them in their own words, typically with modifications. Patthey-Chavez and Ferris (1997) stress that great care should be given when involved in a writing conference, especially with weaker L2 writers.

In writing conferences, composition instructors should be aware of how they interact with both weaker and more proficient writers; however, as international students may often be considered weaker writers in mainstream classes, teachers in mainstream classes may need to be especially aware of their interactions during conferences with NNSE, ensuring that they give the

same type of instruction to and allowance for participation from international students as compared to L1 writers.

Additional research has pointed to a relationship between instructor interaction and the possible influences it may have on both student participation in writing conferences as well as subsequent revisions. Ewert's (2009) study observed the interactions of two experienced ESL composition instructors with three different students each. Ewert was concerned with how different strategies of negotiation and scaffolding by instructors during conferences may affect the amount of participation by students. Although both instructors were experienced in ESL composition, they showed different interaction strategies. One instructor allowed for more student response time and tailored the amount and type of negotiation and scaffolding she used depending on the proficiency level of the student. She was able to do this by providing time at the beginning of the conference for students to address what they believed to be the areas they were struggling with in their writing. The other instructor in the study allowed for less student response time than the first and did not tailor responses to student proficiency level, treating all students the same.

In addition, Ewert (2009) found that although both instructors stated that their intention was to focus on content and rhetorical features, only one of the instructors actually focused on these features during the conference. The second instructor focused instead on language problems, which "sometimes led to a guessing game, thus limiting the learners' ability to respond to (…) questions during the conferences or to initiate questions of their own about their writing" (Ewert, 2009, p. 267). Analysis of conference transcripts showed less interaction from students in conferences with this instructor as compared to the first instructor. Ewert (2009) suggests that the difference in focus (rhetorical features and content vs. language) between the

two instructors may have led to more interaction from the students and that "a focus on content and rhetoric may motivate more participation" (p. 267). Ultimately, Ewert believes that this focus on content with the resulting increased participation on the part of the student will lead to more successful revisions and learning.

Composition instructors who use conferencing with their students may need to make sure that the type of interaction they are providing their students allows for participation on the part of the students. In addition, they may want to ensure that the type of feedback they are giving is in line with the goals they have set for the conference. Asking students to begin each conference with an identification of what they believe are their challenges may allow an instructor to identify the appropriate amount of scaffolding a student might need to improve their writing. This may be especially important for international students, as this type of interaction is important for the success of their revisions.

Expectations of Academic Integrity

Plagiarism and "ownership" of intellectual property are concepts that may be difficult for international students to understand because American concepts of these ideas may be different than those of the students' home countries. International students may struggle to understand and navigate what is considered plagiarism in the American classroom and what is not. As Leki (1992) points out,

> Native students are taught [in secondary schools] that they must not present someone else's work as their own (…). We think of what we write as our personal possession. But these attitudes toward (…) writing as property do not prevail worldwide" (p. 71).

She further argues that "it is important to explain to [international] students our (…) attitudes toward plagiarism" (p.71).

Additional studies have echoed this call for an explanation of plagiarism. For example, Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) argue that "[international] students' problems with citation of sources have mainly been attributed to lack of knowledge about the norms imposed by the institution" (p.32). Explicit explanations of what constitutes plagiarism in an American academic setting are most likely needed by international students. These are explanations international students may not receive in mainstream classes. Instructors may assume that everyone in the class understands what constitutes plagiarism since the majority of the class consists of native students or may only provide a cursory explanation that may be inadequate for international students for whom this is a new or foreign concept. Failure to provide explicit explanation and examples may result in accusations of plagiarism for unsuspecting students. Although numerous studies have examined plagiarism and the concept of "intellectual property," especially with regard to different views determined by different cultures (e.g. Sowden, 2005; East, 2006; Maxwell, Curtis, & Vardanega, 2008; Wheeler, 2009), only a few will be examined here.

One study looked at Japanese university students' attitudes toward or knowledge of plagiarism as compared to American students' knowledge and attitudes, specifically considering what kind of training each might have received on issues of plagiarism. Rinnert and Kobayashi's (2005) study used questionnaires and interviews to explore understanding of plagiarism by Japanese students (n=715) compared to a small group of American students (n=76). A Mann-Whitney *U*-test showed statistical differences between Japanese and American attitudes towards citation practices. Japanese students were less likely to reference outside sources than American students were. They were also less likely to be concerned about proper citation format when they did include references for outside sources. Japanese students also showed a higher acceptance of using someone else's ideas as their own (56% of respondents) than American students (5% of

respondents). In this specific case, however, Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) recommended caution in comparison of these results since the word used in the Japanese translation for *plagiarism* may not have carried as negative a connotation as the term *plagiarism* does in English, which could account for the more lax attitude by the Japanese students in the study.

In the same study, Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) also looked at the effect a Japanese students' major may have on their perceptions of plagiarism. Their results suggested that students in liberal arts majors were more aware of plagiarism than students in the sciences. Additionally, Japanese students in all majors expressed the need for more instruction on citation practices. Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) also found that there was no systematic training on proper citation practices or strict implementation of repercussions stemming from identified plagiarism at universities in Japan. This lack of training on citation and failure to address plagiarism may account for the difference in attitudes between Japanese and American students.

In addition to their results, Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) offer suggestions for classroom instruction to international students regarding citation of sources and discussions on plagiarism. First, they believe instructors should investigate students' beliefs on borrowing others' ideas and words and facilitate students' investigation into their own ideas on plagiarism. Second, instructors should help students identify times in which they may be tempted to use others' ideas as their own and suggest ways to avoid these situations (such as budgeting their time wisely). Third, instructors should teach skills that help students avoid plagiarism, such as paraphrasing and summarizing. Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) note that "without much experience using such skills in their first language, students may find it difficult to adopt them in a second language" (p. 47). This observation echoes the findings of Cumming (1989) that students may be able to transfer certain writing expertise from their L1 to the L2. Finally, Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005)

suggest ensuring that all instructors at a particular institution present a unified front on what constitutes plagiarism.

Other studies have looked at plagiarism on a smaller scale. One study explored the experience of a Taiwanese student identified as a "plagiarist" by a writing tutor at an American university (Ouellette, 2008). In this study, Ouellette explores the writing choices of the student ("Annie") that led to the accusation of plagiarism. The accusation of plagiarism was mostly based on Annie's use of patch writing, however, Ouellette argues that there was "more going on than mere copying and pasting and a denial of self as plagiarist (on the part of the student)" (p. 261). Through interviews, journal entries, and subsequent essay drafts, Ouellette, who was also Annie's writing instructor, examined her writing choices and ensuing transformation from one draft to the next. He identified that part of her choices for using information from the original work stemmed from her lack of time to incorporate proper language for citation as well as her lack in experience of using quotes and paraphrases. These findings echo the suggestion of Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) that L2 writers need to be taught specific strategies in order to avoid the temptation of plagiarism.

Through visits to the university's Writing Center and feedback from her professor, Annie was able to better establish her own voice and style of writing in her essay, ultimately finding her identity in her writing in a way that didn't cause her to rely on the words and ideas of others'. From this experience, Ouellette (2008) questions how best to deal with plagiarism with regard to L2 learners. While he doesn't believe that composition instructors should ignore plagiarism, he argues that identifying plagiarism as "honest/dishonest (…) can obstruct discussion of intermediate stages of learning altogether" (p. 269). Again, discussions of what is and what is not plagiarism and how to navigate between the two, might be best served in an international section

of a composition class, although Ouellette was able to navigate it in his mainstream class on a personal basis with this particular student. It might be impractical, however, to expect composition instructors in mainstream classes to do the same with their international students, given the instructional load many carry.

The types of steps identified by Rinnert and Kobayashi (2005) to help international students avoid plagiarism may be difficult to incorporate into a mainstream composition class. These types of activities and awareness raising would most likely be best used in an international-only composition class where students come from a variety of backgrounds and types of instruction on what may or may not be plagiarism. For international students enrolled in mainstream classes, they may have only a cursory understanding of plagiarism in the American academic system without such explicit instruction, leaving them open to accusations of plagiarism and the consequences that may follow. How instructors choose to deal with these accusations may have an effect on the students' experience in the classroom, as discussed by Ouellette.

In addition to the handling of questions of academic integrity on the part of instructors, there are other ways that an instructor can affect the kind of experience that international students have in the classroom. An instructor's background and the type of experience that they have in working with L2 learners can shape the way they view and interact with international students in the classroom.

Instructors' Perceptions of L2 Learners

Instructors in the composition classroom can play a large role in the success of international students. Just as international students come to the American classroom with various experiences, instructors come with a varied background in their experiences and

knowledge in working with students of linguistically diverse backgrounds. Matsuda (2006b) makes the argument that regardless of the kind of instructional environment, it is "crucial for teachers to be knowledgeable about and have experience in working with ESL writers" (p. 155). He makes this argument because most instructors, both composition and content instructors, will have L2 writers enrolled in their classes at some point and their knowledge and experience with L2 writers may help alleviate frustrations and struggles on both sides.

Other researchers have also called for instructors to be aware of and have knowledge about L2 writers' struggles and difficulties. Burt (2010) states:

> If we accept (…) that language is socially and culturally constructed, instructors should begin their assessment of ESL student writing by identifying student goals in the target language of communication, discussing conventions of the language of origin and English, and learning about the student's background culture and language as appropriate. (p. 4)

Burt (2010) further argues that this type of approach to assessment and ultimately to the teaching of writing "refrains from any indication that English is superior" (p.4). With this type of understanding, it may be easier for students to ask questions or feel comfortable talking with an instructor. It may also ease the transition of writing in their L1 to writing in their L2. On the side of the instructor, it may help them understand the difficulties faced by L2 writers.

A number of studies have explored the perceptions that instructors have of international students and the effect this may have in the classroom. Instructors may not always be aware of their role in the difficulties that NNSE face in the classroom. Additionally, research has shown that NNSE writers are not always assessed equally to their NSE counterparts, both by instructors as well as exam raters, which can have consequences as to NNSEs' success in the classroom.

In an early study on instructor perceptions of international students at the university level, Zamel (1995) surveyed instructors to identify what many had called the "ESL Problem," or the way in which faculty felt that students from various L1s "constrain[ed]" the work the instructors were doing in the classroom (p. 507). One common theme she identified from instructor responses was a confusion of language ability with cognitive ability; many instructors felt that international students' lack of proficiency in writing and speaking meant that they were not adequately prepared at a cognitive level to complete the work that was required in class. These feelings were most likely perceived by the international students at the university. In a corresponding survey of students at the university, international students responded that they continued to struggle at the university level, but they "voiced their concern that these struggles not be viewed as deficiencies [and] that their efforts be understood as serious attempts to grapple with these difficulties" (Zamel, 1995, p. 512). Zamel's (1995) study suggests that students may be aware when instructors have negative attitudes towards them or misunderstandings of their somewhat limited language abilities. It also suggests that some instructors may need help in distinguishing between linguistic issues in the classroom and a students' lack of understanding of course material. How instructors perceive international students' struggles may often be related to the background of the instructor; that is, their perceptions may be related to the types of experiences they have had in working with diverse populations.

One particular study, conducted by Youngs and Youngs (2001) aimed to identify specific predictors and their relative importance in instructor attitudes towards ESL students. This study was a follow-up to an earlier study in which they discovered that mainstream instructors can see both advantages and disadvantages to having ESL students in their classes. Youngs and Youngs (2001) examined five factors (educational background, foreign culture contact, ESL training,

contact with ESL students, and certain demographic traits) through a survey completed by 143 mainstream teachers at junior high/middle schools. Based on their analysis, Youngs and Youngs (2001) determined that teachers are more likely to have positive attitudes towards ESL students if the teachers have had exposure to other cultures or languages through experiences such as ESL training, living or teaching outside of the U.S., studying a foreign language, or taking a multicultural education course. Additional predictors of a positive attitude towards ESL students included being female and working in the social/natural sciences or humanities. Although they identified previous ESL training as having a positive effect on perceptions of ESL students, they were unable to identify what type of training might be the most successful. Their research provides support for the idea that mainstream instructors should have some type of exposure to cultural diversity in order to have positive attitudes towards international students. As Youngs and Youngs (2001) point out, this is especially important given that instructors can have a strong effect on how well students do within their classes.

Additionally, some of the challenges in American classrooms can come from the instructors of those classes who may be unfamiliar with working with international students. An additional study (Joseph, 1992, as cited in Braine, 1994a) of the attitudes of composition instructors identified some of the difficulties they felt they faced in working with international students in mainstream classes. Complaints of teachers of mainstreamed international students were that international students needed more explanation which tended to bore NSE, miscommunication occurred because instructors had difficulty understanding NNSE, and that NNSE students performed poorly in teacher conferences (Joseph, 1992, as cited in Braine, 1994a). Additionally, instructors who have not had training on teaching English Language Learners may not be aware of differences that may cause difficulties for these students, and may

consider international students poor writers (e.g. Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995; Matsuda, 2006a). These instructors may also be unable to determine what the "rhetorical differences caused by different language backgrounds" are that instructors with more familiarity with NNSE writers may be able to determine (Braine, 1994a, p. 42). A combination of cultural factors, student attitudes, and teacher attitudes can make a mainstream composition classroom a challenge for international students.

Additional research provides insight into the attitudes of instructors on the inclusion of ESL students into mainstream classes. Reeves (2006) investigated the attitudes of secondary mainstream teachers (n=278) on the inclusion of ESL students in their classroom through a survey. Results from her survey indicate that teachers generally had a neutral to slightly welcoming attitude towards the inclusion of ESL students in their classes, similar to the findings of Youngs and Youngs (2001). However, many felt that mainstreaming did not benefit all students and that ESL students should not be mainstreamed until they reached a certain level of proficiency. Respondents also felt that they "did not have enough time to deal with the needs of ESL students" (p. 136). With respect to modification of course work for ESL students, teachers felt that coursework should not be simplified or lessened for ESL students, but teachers felt that allowing ESL students more time to finish their work was acceptable. Finally, many of the teachers in the study felt that they were underprepared to work with ESL students, but were ambivalent about taking part in professional development related to working with ESL students.

Reeves (2006) identified that there were some discrepancies in the responses, such as a majority who said that mainstreaming did not benefit all students, but that it created a "positive education environment" (p. 137). Reeves offered several reasons for the discrepancies she identified, including that respondents may have felt the need to provide socially acceptable

answers. Reeves (2006) also believed that the discrepancies may have represented "the complexity of teachers' thinking concerning ELL inclusion" (p.137). She further clarifies this by explaining that teachers may have a generally positive attitude towards inclusion of ESL students, but may have negative attitudes or experiences with specific students. It may also represent their lack of confidence in working with ESL students. Reeves (2006) final thought is that "although the findings presented here suggest that teachers want to welcome ELLs into the mainstream, the data also reveal a teaching force struggling to make sense of teaching and learning in multilingual (…) environments" (p. 139).

Research has also shown that English instructors who are not trained in ESL may assign lower holistic scores to NNSE based on grammatical and lexical errors, rather than basing their scores on the rhetorical features of the text. In one such study, Sweedler-Brown (1993) took six ESL essays that were fairly strong in the rhetorical features examined for scoring in a college composition program. The essays were then corrected for linguistic errors typical of NNSE; however, errors typical of NSE remained in order to make these six essays closely resemble the writing of NSE. These six essays were then given to six experienced composition raters; the six original essays went to three of the raters and the corrected six to the remaining three raters. Essays were then given a holistic score ranging from 1-6, with 4 considered as a passing score. Results showed that errors were a strong determining factor in the holistic score given to essays. Of the 18 uncorrected essays, 16 were assigned a failing grade and two a passing grade; of the 18 corrected essays, one was assigned a failing grade and 17 a passing grade. Based on these results, Sweedler-Brown (1993) makes the argument that at the very least, NSE and NNSE writing should be assessed separately and that perhaps holistic scoring is not the most appropriate assessment measurement for ESL texts. Raters or instructors not trained in ESL may have a hard

time separating errors in ESL writing from their evaluation of the text. Considering that this may affect whether students pass or fail a course, it can have important ramifications for NNSE enrolled in mainstream classes where instructors are not trained in working with language learners.

A more recent study looked at the accuracy and construct validity of assessment of ESL writing compared with assessment of native English speaker writing in secondary schools in Canada. Huang (2012) explored the accuracy and construct validity using *G*-theory, which uses Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine where variance may occur in scoring. The study used tests which were part of a reading and writing test required of secondary students in 12th grade in Canada from 2001, 2002, and 2003 for comparisons between NSE and NNSE writers. Huang (2012) determined that raters were less consistent with their scoring of NNSE writing than they were NSE writing, indicating that raters were not as experienced at rating NNSE writing. He additionally identified unwanted variance between NNSE and NSE writing scores, indicating that there may be questions about the construct validity and accuracy of the writing test if initial scores were used. Ultimately, Huang (2012) believes that these questions raise concerns about a bias when it comes to assessing NNSE's writing and "may suggest an unequal ability for raters to use the analytic scales for ESL students' writing as compared to NSE students' writing" (p. 137). This implies that raters may need to use a different method of assessing NNSE's writing or that raters should be trained in assessing NNSE's writing so that they are more able to accurately assess it compared with the writing of NSE.

Instructional Settings for Teaching Composition

As can be seen, international students face a variety of challenges in the classroom, some specific to the composition classroom, such as discomfort with peer review and discrepancies

between scoring of NNSE writing when compared to NSE. Other challenges, such as lack of interaction with NSE can occur in both composition classes as well as content classes. Because of, and in spite of these challenges, arguments are still made as to the most effective placement option for international students enrolling in American university composition classes. The strongest arguments for international-only placement come from comparisons of performance of international students in mainstream vs. international-only composition classes. In contrast, other studies have identified certain benefits international students may receive while enrolled in mainstream classes. Finally, a third group has begun to argue for a third option, often called a "mixed" classroom in which a roughly equal number of international and American students are enrolled.

International-Only Sections of Composition Classes

Much of the literature reviewed has indicated specific problems that international students may face when enrolled in composition classes, suggesting that international-only composition classes may be most beneficial to international students for many reasons. First, they may provide specific instruction that is most likely not needed by American students enrolled in composition classes, such as explicit identification and discussion on what is and is not plagiarism (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005; Ouellette, 2008). Also, cultural differences with regards to writing expectations, such as text organization, expression of voice and self, and support in argument writing can be addressed in international-only sections on a level that they probably could not in mainstream classes (Silva, 1993; Angelova & Riazantseva, 1999; Ramanathan & Atkinson, 2006). Additionally, international students may feel more comfortable working with other international students rather than American students and be more willing to participate in class and group discussions (Harklau, 1994; Braine, 1996; Hsieh, 2007).

International-only sections of composition may also provide instruction as to appropriate interaction and comments during peer-review in a manner that is well-suited for international students who may be uncomfortable with such an activity (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 2006; Zhu, 2006). Finally, instructors who are more familiar with L2 writing may be better able to assess writing produced by international students.

A strong proponent of international-only composition classes, Braine (1994b) showed that there were dramatic improvements in ESL students' achievement in composition after enrolling in ESL only sections. In the composition program where the study took place, there originally was no choice for international students. All international students were enrolled in either remedial writing classes or mainstream composition classes. They frequently complained about the composition program; their main complaints related to the fact that they couldn't pass the final exam, they were expected to write at the same proficiency level as NSE, and they felt isolated in mainstream classes. Braine (1994b) noted that the International Students Services office was also concerned about the situation, as they believed that it might result in lower international student enrollment if steps were not taken to address the problems.

As a result of these concerns, specific international-only sections of the composition class were created and piloted for a semester. Following the piloted course, more international-only sections were created and instructors, who volunteered to teach these sections, received training on working with ESL writers during a three-day workshop. Because international students were not required to enroll in these specific sections, a comparison between the performance of international students in the mainstream sections and international-only sections could be made. Braine (1994b) found that after the first semester of implementation, international students in the ESL sections performed better than international students in the mainstream classes. Students

enrolled in the ESL sections had a 90% pass rate in the course, compared to the 60% pass rate of ESL students in the mainstream classes. International students in the ESL sections also surpassed the 75% pass rate of native-speaking students in mainstream classes. These differences in success rates were attributed to the fact that the international-only sections addressed specific needs of international students. Braine (1994b) argues that this is a strong reason for advocating for ESL sections of composition courses based on the difference in pass rates of international students in mainstream classes versus those in ESL only sections.

Mainstreaming

In contrast to those proponents of international-only sections of composition, others have identified benefits to mainstreaming international students. Some studies have shown that international students can be successful in mainstream composition classes and may even be more successful in certain areas than their NSE counterparts.

Early research made into the debate between placing NSSE and NSE together or separately in composition classes suggests that mainstream classes can provide benefits for NNSE that they might not otherwise gain if in a separate classroom. Healy and Hall (1994) argue that NNSE and NSE in a composition classroom can complement each other based on the strengths of each group. NSE bring with them their language skills as well as their "intuitive, usually unconscious, grasp of the language and associated culture" (p.21). In addition, NSE understand the structure of American academic writing and the need for full explanation of their points to their audience, something that they can help make their NNSE counterparts aware of. On the other side, NNSE can also provide benefits to NSE in their composition class. Healy and Hall (1994) argue that NSE may "have taken their school years for granted and have comparatively casual attitudes toward education," which can make them unprepared for the

rigors of academia (p. 23). NNSE, Healy and Hall (1994) argue, often have worked hard to become proficient in a second language and can therefore provide a good model of how to work hard in higher education to NSE. Their argument includes not only the benefits that NNSE receive from being placed in mainstream composition classes, but the benefits they can provide to NSE in the same classes.

Studies have also shown that international students can be successful in mainstream composition classes and may experience benefits that their NSE counterparts in the same class do not. In a study of three international students in a college composition class, Stuart (2012) found that international students may experience a greater sense of learning than their native speaker counterparts, despite being skeptical of the benefits of the class at the beginning of the semester. This study tracked three international students, three native English speaking students, and their instructor over the course of a first year writing class. Despite the fact that international students entering the composition class were "far less equipped than their L1 peers to see the class as familiar and manageable," they ultimately were more engaged in the class than their L1 counterparts because their anxiety caused them to be more actively involved in asking questions and participating (Stuart, 2012, p. 138). Because of this, the international students felt that they experienced learning in the class while the majority of their L1 counterparts did not.

Another study that supports allowing international students to enroll in mainstream classes suggests that there is little uniform preference on the part of international students for international-only sections vs. mainstream sections (Costino & Hyon, 2007). Costino and Hyon's study provided evidence from interviews of nine L2 writers who first completed either a mainstream or multilingual basic composition class before enrolling in a mainstream first year college composition class. Their results showed that students preferred the type of basic

composition class (either mainstream or multilingual) that they had been enrolled in and that their preference was related to wanting to be in a class that was appropriate for their language ability and being in a class with other students who are "like them" (Costino & Hyon, 2007, p. 72). Those students who were in the mainstream classes felt that they were with other students who were "like them" because they felt that their language ability was on par with NSE rather than needing to be in a class with students whose language ability may be at a lower proficiency.

Some studies have suggested mixed results of international students' opinions and experiences in mainstream composition classrooms. Saberi-Najafi and Chandler (2012) reported that international students felt comfortable working with NSE in a mainstream composition class, that the class improved their understanding of American culture, and that their instructors listened to them. However, the same international students also reported feeling isolated in their classes and this lead to them asking fewer questions in class (Saberi-Najafi & Chandler, 2012). Students also reportedly worried about "affective issues, cultural differences, and linguistic difficulties" (p.16). When given the choice, the majority of students indicated that they would rather enroll in a mainstream class than an international-only class; however, when a cross-cultural class was presented as a third option, students overwhelmingly preferred that option to the first two (Saberi-Najafi & Chandler, 2012). This type of class is discussed below.

An Additional Option: Mixed Composition Classes

Although colleges have traditionally placed international students in either mainstream or international-only sections of composition classes, a new option has emerged in the last few years. This new option, often called a "mixed class," involves placing students into composition classes of roughly equal numbers of international and NSE writers. Ibrahim & Penfield (2005) identified benefits of mixed classes in a study of a class composed of 15 international students

and 10 NSE students. For all students, these benefits included increased interest in the class because of cultural diversity; for international students the benefits included developing more self-confidence in speaking during class and in communication in general, improved writing performance, and efficient treatment of grammar problems.

In their 1999 study, Matsuda and Silva, who called their mixed class a "cross-cultural classroom," stated that the reason for integrating roughly equal numbers of NNSE and NSE into one composition classroom was to "offer an environment which is less threatening to ESL writers (…) while providing an optimal learning opportunity for all students involved" (p. 16). Their class, composed of both NNSE (n=12) and NSE (n=8), focused not only on writing, but on cross-cultural understanding and exchange as well. In order to prepare for major writing assignments, students were asked to journal about cross-cultural communication, reflecting on how cultural differences affected communication both inside and outside of the classroom. These journal entries then served as a basis for reflection and incorporation into the major writing assignments, which focused on cultural differences.

Although not all students had the same classroom experiences, Matsuda and Silva's (1999) study showed that as the semester progressed, many NNSE became less intimidated by their NSE counterparts and were able to speak up more in class. Matsuda and Silva (1999) recommend implementing cross-cultural composition classes when possible; the two challenges to implementing such classes included staffing (by an instructor comfortable working with both NSE and NNSE writers) and placement procedures (to ensure roughly equal numbers of both).

Advocating Student Choice

Because of the differences among international students and the often contradictory results of studies on preferences by international students for placement, many within the field

advocate for international students being given the choice of their preferred instructional situation for composition. Despite being a strong proponent of placing students in international-only composition classes, Braine (1996) was one of the first researchers to call for allowing students to have a choice in their placement. He argues:

> Instead of feeling compelled to enroll in mainstream classes, the choice should be left to the students. Those who feel that special classes provide a more productive environment (…) will choose to enroll in ESL classes. Others may prefer the challenge of mainstream classes. (Braine, 1996, p. 103)

Matsuda (2006b) echoes this argument, but extends the choices beyond the two suggested by Braine (1996). Matsuda (2006b) argues that international students should be given the choice between four instructional situations: mainstream composition classes, sheltered ESL composition classes, basic writing classes, or classes that are specifically designed to incorporate both international and native English speaking students. As of now, these different options may not be available in all university composition programs, but provide suggestions for where composition programs may consider heading for future placement options.

Costino and Hyon's (2007) study makes the argument that students may be successful and feel comfortable in either mainstream or international-only composition classes and that students should have a strong say in placement options and decisions. One reason to advocate for a choice in placement options is that international students may decide to take a mainstream composition class because they believe that the international-only section may not be as challenging or provide the best option for improving their English writing abilities (Matsuda & Silva, 1999). Matsuda and Silva (1999) also argue that international students must learn to work

with NSE because once they have finished the composition class they are faced with interacting and competing with NSE in content classes.

Statement of Problem

Özturgut and Murphy (2010) argue that despite numerous studies that address specific needs of international students, universities are not doing enough to meet these needs. They argue that there is a gap between what the research recommends and the practices universities put into place. This gap is a result of the "fact that it is not a requirement for the people involved (…) in U.S. higher education institutions to engage in relationships to make [international students'] experiences culturally, socially, and educationally worthwhile" (Özturgut & Murphy, 2010, p. 380). These ideas were echoed by Matsuda (2006a) when he called for all composition instructors to be familiar with and receive training in working with international students. The research has shown that international students struggle in writing in English, yet many instructors of mainstream composition classes lack training in working with ESL students, despite the fact that many international students will enroll in mainstream composition classes.

The issue of international students in the college composition classroom is not one that is likely to disappear anytime soon. International student enrollment in US universities has increased 32% in the last ten years and enrollment has shown an increase every year between 2006 and 2011 (Institute of International Education, 2011). Many higher education institutions, including the one in this study, often actively recruit international students for a number of reasons. These reasons include increasing ethnic diversity, increasing the international reputation of the school, and increasing revenue for the school in the form of foreign capital since they pay out-of-state rates for tuition (Dadak, 2006; Kubota and Abels, 2006, as cited in Matsuda, 2006a). As enrollment increases, additional options as suggested by Matsuda (2006b) may become more

of a reality for composition programs and the international students enrolled in their classes. Further insight into the experiences of international students in these various options may provide information that could help guide future students when making a placement decision.

In the present study, two enrollment options are currently offered to international students who test into the basic composition class (CO150): 1) mainstream class or 2) international-only section. Both are meant to prepare students to write for an American academic audience. In contrast to the mainstream classes, however, the international-only sections typically spend additional time focusing on challenges specifically faced by international students, such as text organization, identification of linguistic errors, and discussion of what constitutes plagiarism in the U.S. Also, international-only sections are taught by instructors who have experience working with international students and typically have completed an M.A. in TESL/TEFL. Many international students are encouraged by their academic advisors (typically who are not composition instructors) to enroll in international-only sections without a discussion of whether they would prefer to enroll in a mainstream class instead. Additionally, these international-only sections often fill quickly and international students are left with the choice to either enroll in a mainstream class or wait until a later semester to see if space is available in an international-only section at a later time. To date there has been no comparison of the experiences of international students in the two sections and whether students' experiences between the two classes differ. Insight into these experiences may help in guiding future international students in their choice for instructional setting as well as provide advisors of international students information that they can use in helping students make those choices. Finally, it may identify areas in which either international students or instructors feel they need additional support.

The present study aims to compare the experiences of international students in these two types of instructional settings as well as instructors of mainstream classes through questionnaires and interviews. Specifically, two general research questions were addressed:

1. To what extent are the experiences of international students who enroll in mainstream and international-only CO150 classes similar?

2. What are the experiences of instructors who have international students in their CO150 classes and are their perceptions of international students' experience similar to the students' perceptions?

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

This study had two central goals: 1) to examine and compare international students' experiences in composition classes and 2) to describe the experiences of instructors of mainstream composition classes who have enrolled international students and compare their perceptions of international students' experiences with the students' perceptions.

International student and instructor experiences and perceptions were investigated using surveys and interviews. Separate surveys were constructed for students in international-only CO150 sections, international students in mainstream CO150 classes, and instructors teaching mainstream CO150 classes with international students. Surveys included questions on demographic information, Likert scale statements, and open-ended short-answer questions. Interview questions were constructed so that they could provide additional information that might help explain or expand on answers given on surveys. Interview questions were similar for students in the mainstream and international-only sections and were aimed at exploring why students chose the sections they did, whether the writing they did in CO150 helped them in other CSU classes, their comfort level in the classroom, and what types of support (office hours, Writing Center, etc.) they may have used while enrolled in the class. Instructor surveys were aimed at exploring the perceptions of the instructors of their international students' experiences, their previous experience working with international students, and whether they felt they had enough support in terms of working with international students. Interview questions targeted those areas as well so that a more complete picture of instructors' experiences and perceptions could be explored.

Research Design

In this study, general experiences of groups as a whole were examined, as well as individual experiences. As a result, a mixed-method approach was used in order to investigate the research questions. Survey data was analyzed quantitatively through descriptive statistics and qualitative methods were used to investigate interview responses.

Context of the Study

Colorado State University (CSU), the university where the study took place, currently requires all undergraduate students to take and pass CO150 (College Composition) or its equivalent in order to graduate. The only exceptions are students who are able to place out of the class through transfer credit, a score of 5 on the AP English Composition and Literature exam or a score of 4 or 5 on the AP English Language and Composition exam. Remaining students must then place into CO150 either through scores on the ACT or SAT or by taking an English department sponsored placement exam. Of the students who take the English department placement exam, 95% place into CO150 (Lisa Langstraat, personal communication, August 28, 2013). Students who place at a level lower than CO150 must take and pass a more basic writing class (CO130) before enrolling in CO150. Some may be required to first take the Writing Center Tutorial (WCT) through the university's Writing Center if their writing skills place them a level lower than CO130. Those who place at a higher level than CO150 enroll in CO150.550 and receive credit for CO150. When international students take the placement exam, they may choose to indicate that English is not their first language, although they are not required to do so. All exams are assessed by the same raters.

Both mainstream and international-only sections of CO150 are currently offered through the composition program at CSU. Although the composition program offers international-only

sections, international students are not required to enroll in these sections. When it is time for students to enroll in classes for the next semester, a member of the English department contacts students who self-identified as NNSE, and informs them of the option to enroll in an international-only section of CO150. Sometimes a rater may indicate on the placement exam that a NNSE has performed well on the placement exam and does not need to be enrolled in an international-only section, but these students are still contacted so they can decide if they want that option (Sue Russell, personal communication, February 18, 2014). If a student has not self-identified as a NNSE on their placement exam, they will not be contacted about the option.

International students who are contacted may elect to join either a mainstream section of CO150, which includes a mixture of traditional students, generation 1.5 students, and non-traditional students or they may elect to join an international-only student section of CO150. International-only sections are only open to international students and if they wish to enroll in one of these sections, they must receive an override into the section. International-only sections of CO150 are taught by instructors who have experience working with L2 learners and who have an M.A. in TESL/TEFL, often completed through the M.A. TESL/TEFL program at CSU.

Sections of CO150 are capped at either 19 or 24 students, depending on whether a faculty member or English Graduate Teaching Assistant (enrolled in the M.A. TESL/TEFL program) is teaching the class. For the past three semesters, there have been four sections of the international-only sections of CO150, resulting in 86-96 international students enrolled in these sections. Since international students are not tracked in the composition program, an unknown number of international students are enrolled in mainstream classes each semester, however, an informal survey conducted by the researcher estimates that there are at least ten to fourteen international students enrolled in mainstream classes each semester.

Participants and Data Collection

Student participants were international students enrolled in either a mainstream class of CO150 or one of the international-only sections of CO150. Students were contacted at the end of Fall 2013 semester and the beginning of Spring 2014 semester for participation in the study. Participation in the study was voluntary and all participants completed an IRB consent form.

Participants from the international-only sections represented five different classes, four from Fall 2013 and one from Spring 2014. These five classes were taught by three different instructors. To recruit participants from the international-only sections, I contacted the instructors of these courses and made arrangements to attend the first five minutes of their class in order to explain my research. I passed out the survey to students in the five different sections and then collected the surveys during the next class. Once the surveys and consent forms were returned, they were separated so that survey answers remained anonymous. Each survey was coded with "IS" for international-only section student and a number. For example, a survey would have the code "IS1" indicating that the survey was from student one in an international-only section.

Participants from the mainstream classes were identified through communication with CO150 instructors. I sent an email to all CO150 instructors asking if they had international students enrolled in their classes as well as contacting instructors individually. Once I had identified which mainstream classes had international students enrolled in them, I made arrangements to meet these students at the end of their class. I met with the international student in each class, explained my research and, if they agreed to participate, gave them the survey and then collected the survey during the next class. Once the surveys and consent forms were returned, they were separated so that survey answers remained anonymous. Each survey was

coded with “MS” for mainstream class student and a number. For each example, a survey would have the code “MS1” indicating that the survey was from student one in a mainstream class. Participants from the mainstream classes represented students from twelve different classes and ten different instructors. Participation was voluntary.

In both instructional situations (mainstream and international-only), students were identified for the interview by their agreement on the consent form. Four students from the international-only sections agreed to an interview and three students from the mainstream classes agreed to an interview. Students were contacted via email to arrange a time and meeting place for interviews. Interviews took place on campus, typically in a study room in the library and lasted approximately 20 to 25 minutes.

Instructor participants were identified by contacting CO150 instructors to determine who had international students currently enrolled in their mainstream CO150 classes. Surveys were either emailed to instructors or given to them in person. Once the surveys and consent forms were returned, they were separated so that survey answers remained anonymous. Each survey was coded with “INS” for instructor and given a number. For each example, a survey would have the code “INS1” indicating that the survey was from instructor one. Eight instructors agreed to complete the survey and of those eight, two agreed to be interviewed. Interviews occurred in my office or over the phone.

Interviews for all participants lasted approximately twenty minutes. Interviews were semi-structured to allow for a guided discussion, but still allow for clarification, expansion, and addition of ideas and comments. For those participants who agreed to be recorded, their interviews were recorded and then transcribed. Once the interviews were transcribed, the

recordings were deleted. For those participants who did not agree to be recorded, notes were taken during the interview to accurately represent their responses to questions.

International-only participants. Eighteen students from the international-only sections elected to participate in the study. Participants represented eight different language backgrounds (see Table 1). Students had studied English for between two to fourteen years (*M*=8.78 yrs; *SD*=3.89 yrs). For most students, the semester that they participated in the study was their first semester at CSU, although five students had been enrolled at CSU for between one and three semesters prior to the semester of the study (*M*=0.78 yrs; *SD*=0.46 yrs). Additionally, some students had not taken any writing courses in English prior to enrollment in CO150 while others reported that they had taken writing courses prior to enrollment. These previous writing classes occurred either in the AEP associated with CSU (INTO) or in their home country.

Table 1

International-Only Section Student Language Backgrounds

Language	N
Chinese	9
Arabic	3
Russian	1
Vietnamese	1
Taiwanese	1
Malay	1
Korean	1
Thai	1

Mainstream class participants. Fourteen international students enrolled in mainstream classes elected to participate in the study. Participants represented seven different language backgrounds (see Table 2). Students had studied English for between three to nineteen years before enrollment in CO150 (*M*=9.96 yrs; *SD*=5.58 yrs). For many students, the semester of the study was their first semester at CSU, while some students had been enrolled at CSU for three and half years (*M*=0.93 yrs; *SD*=0.85 yrs). Additionally, some students had not taken any writing

courses in English prior to enrollment in CO150, while others had taken up to four English writing classes. These previous writing classes occurred either in the AEP associated with CSU (INTO), AEPs associated with other universities, or in their home country.

Table 2

Mainstream International Student Language Backgrounds

Language	N
Chinese	5
Arabic	4
Norwegian	1
Portuguese	1
English/Twi	1
Malay/Chinese	1
Swedish	1

Instructor participants. Eight instructors agreed to complete the survey. Of those, three were adjunct English instructors while five were Graduate Teaching Assistants enrolled in master's programs in the English department. Instructors had between one semester and six years' experience teaching CO150 at CSU (*M*=2.38 yrs; *SD*=1.87 yrs). Instructors had either one or two students currently enrolled in their classes and had taught between one to four international students during their time as a CO150 instructor. One instructor had taught ESL classes prior to teaching CO150, three others had had international students in previous semesters of CO150, and the remaining four had had no prior experience working with international students.

Instruments

Three separate, but related, questionnaires were given to students in the international-only sections, mainstream classes, and instructors of mainstream classes with enrolled international students (see Appendices A-C). Questionnaires were based on the survey used in Saberi-Najafi and Chandler's (2010) study of international students' perceptions of their

experiences in composition classes. Although their survey provided the model for this study, questions were modified, expanded, and deleted from their survey to suit the specific research questions addressed in this study. Additional open-ended questions were also added to address the students' reasons for enrolling in their respective classes as well as if they believed their writing or language abilities improved or changed as a result of the class.

Interviews were semi-structured, so that additional questions could be asked for clarification or expansion of answers (see Appendices D and E). Some interview questions were modeled after questions used in Leki and Carson's (1997) study of the comparison between international students' experiences in EAPs and university writing courses. Questions were modified, expanded, deleted, and added to suit the specific needs of the present study.

Analysis of Data

The triangulation of data collection, as described by Creswell and Clark (2007) was chosen for the mixed methods approach in this study. The purpose of this type of design is to "bring together the differing strengths of quantitative methods (…) with those of qualitative methods (…)" (Patton, 1990, as cited in Creswell & Clark, 2007, p. 62). Creswell and Clark (2007) indicate that this type of design is appropriate for studies that wish to "validate or expand quantitative results with qualitative data" (p. 62), as this study sought to do, using data from interviews to further explain and expand general trends that were observed from the quantitative results of the surveys.

As described by Creswell and Clark (2007), convergence model procedures of the triangulation design were used. In the convergence model, quantitative and qualitative data are collected "separately on the same phenomenon and then the results are converged (by comparing and contrasting the different results) during the interpretation" (Creswell & Clark, 2007, p. 64).

The convergence model was chosen because quantitative data (from the questionnaires) was collected separately from qualitative data (interview responses) and then the results were converged during interpretation. However, the convergence model can have some drawbacks, including the challenge of merging the two sets of data (quantitative and qualitative). In order to help mitigate this challenge, interview questions addressed similar concepts as those addressed in the questionnaires; however, they were answered in a more in-depth manner than in the questionnaires.

Quantitative analysis. Questionnaire items were investigated quantitatively. Likert-scale responses from the surveys were assigned a numerical value (strongly agree=4, agree=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1) and then analyzed with descriptive statistics to provide information on general experiences between and within groups. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were computed. Open ended questions from the survey were coded according to themes, following the procedure outlined by Creswell (2003). This coding was accomplished by first reading through the answers, identifying common topics and ideas, which were then grouped into recurring themes. These themes were then placed into related categories. Categories received a code. With the code list, the responses to open-ended questions were reread and coded. The codes for each theme were then counted and these numbers were then transformed into percentages to represent the portion of the participant population whose response correlated with the different identified categories. As some students often gave more than one response, their answers to open-ended questions may have received more than one code.

Qualitative analysis. Responses to interview questions were analyzed qualitatively, following the procedure outlined by Creswell (2003) for interpretation of qualitative data.

Interview responses were first transcribed if they had been recorded. Then, transcripts and notes from non-recorded interviewed were reviewed to get a general sense of the types of answers participants gave to questions. Information in the interviews was then coded for major themes represented in the data. In order to generate these codes, these steps were followed:

- A list of themes was made.
- Themes were grouped into recurrent topics.
- Topics were grouped into categories.
- Categories were coded and applied to the data from the interviews.

Once the interview data was coded, an additional researcher reviewed two interviews using the identified codes. These interviews were coded to determine how closely they matched the initial coding, see if there were any major discrepancies, and identify any missing possible codes. Any discrepancies were discussed between the coders, and the code list adjusted as necessary. Once coding was completed, the associated parts from the interviews were related to the research questions they best addressed. These narrative descriptions were then used to further expand upon trends observed in the quantitative results or provided contrasts to the results, as those experiences were individual to the students being interviewed.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section focuses on the results from the surveys and interviews of international students enrolled in both instructional settings (mainstream and international-only) and instructors of mainstream classes with enrolled international students. The experiences of international students enrolled in international-only sections are discussed first, followed by the experiences of international students enrolled in mainstream classes. Their experiences in their respective section of CO150 are divided into four separate, but related sections: 1) their choice of instructional setting, 2) their comfort level in the classroom, 3) their perception of fulfillment of writing and classroom needs and 4) their preferred enrollment options. Following an explanation of their experiences, the research question of the similarities of their experiences in their respective classes is discussed.

The experiences and perceptions of instructors of mainstream classes with enrolled international students are then described. Instructor experiences are divided into five separate but related sections: 1) perception of international student comfort level in the classroom, 2) perception of mainstream sections' ability to fulfill international student needs, 3) perceived benefits and challenges of having international students enrolled in their mainstream sections, 4) opinion as to the best instructional setting for international students, and 5) satisfaction with the support they receive. Included in this description is a discussion of the similarities and differences of perceptions of instructors compared to international students in mainstream classes.

Experiences of International Students in International-Only Sections

Experiences of international students in international-only sections with respect to their choice of instruction, comfort level, fulfillment of needs, and preferred instructional setting are

discussed below. Results show that international students in international-only sections of CO150 enroll in these sections for similar reasons, feel comfortable in their classes, and feel that their sections are meeting their needs, although interview responses identified some contrasts to survey results.

Choice of instructional setting. International students chose to enroll in international-only sections of CO150 for a variety of reasons. Students were first asked if they were aware that they could enroll in a mainstream section rather than an international-only section of CO150. Although most students indicated that they were aware, four students indicated that they were not aware that they had a choice. All four of these students, however, responded that if they had been aware of the choice, they still would have chosen to enroll in an international-only section, but did not indicate why.

The thirteen students who were aware that they could enroll in a mainstream section, but chose instead to enroll in international-only sections of CO150 stated their reason(s) for their enrollment choice. Five main categories for their enrollment choice were identified (see Table 3).

Table 3

Reasons for Enrollment in International-Only Sections

Reason	N[a]	Percentage[b]
Relative challenge of mainstream vs. I-O	6	43%
Instructor knowledge of international students	4	29%
Recommendation (from advisor/student)	3	22%
More comfortable than mainstream section	2	14%
No response	1	7%

Note. [a]N more than participants in the study because some students gave more than one reason
[b]Total percentage higher than 100% because student answers often contained more than one coded response

Most reasons for enrolling in international-only sections had to do with the perception that mainstream classes would be too challenging for them in comparison to the international-only section (43%). For example, one student stated that, “I’ve heard from the former students

that a mainstream section is too challenging," while another expressed, "I think it will be easier than go to the mainstream class." One student thought that he could not "compete [with] native American student."

What is unclear from these responses is exactly what they believed was the difference in the level of difficulty between the two sections. Since both mainstream and international-only sections of CO150 carry the same objectives, assign similar assignments, and include the same amount of course work, there should be little difference between the two with regard to rigor of the course. Despite the similarities in this program and in other composition classes, many students tend to believe that a difference exists between the two instructional settings. Students, international and American alike, tend to perceive international-only sections of composition classes as less challenging or at a lower level than mainstream classes (Braine, 1994a; Ibrahim & Penfield, 2005). The reasons behind this perception are unclear and bear further exploration. If students believe that the course itself will be easier, in terms of course load, expectations on assignments, and/or expected level of student performance, it is worth ensuring that these perceptions are not reinforced in the classroom, as the international-only sections are expected to prepare students in the same manner as mainstream classes. Communicating this to students as well as advisors would help students make a more informed choice about their preferred instructional setting.

The second highest response category was with respect to the instructor of the course (29%), specifically the instructors' familiarity in working with international students and their knowledge of international students' challenges. Responses for this category included, "that they [the instructor] can explain stuff better [than instructors in mainstream sections]." One student believed that "(…) the instructor of this class has a more effective way to teach international

students like me." Another student was concerned with writing mistakes that international students may make and how the instructor might respond to those mistakes. He replied that, "I think instructors [in international-only sections] would understand the silly mistakes that we do, and native English speakers [mainstream instructors] don't. Grammar for example."

One student specifically referred to her expectations of the instructor as to why she enrolled in the international-only section. She explained:

> I thought the teacher might have more experience working with international students and that we don't have to explain [problems or difficulties] because of culture differences. And the mainstream teachers, I don't know their backgrounds, but they might not be as considerate of our differences. The [international-only] instructor is willing to explain little things (…) and she will double check with us, "do you know what that means?"

This echoes the international students in Zamel's (1995) study who were concerned that instructors in mainstream classes did not take the differences of NNSE into account, making classes a struggle for them. Since instructors of the international-only sections of CO150 have experience working with L2 learners, it is probably a safe assumption on the part of international students that these instructors will be considerate of differences. Instructor experience and background in mainstream classes, however, are more likely to be varied and students who chose to enroll in international-only sections may not be willing to take the chance of having an instructor who is not experienced or knowledgeable about working with L2 writers.

The third category of responses indicated that some students (22%) enrolled in the international-only sections based on recommendations, either from their advisor or from other international students. One student reported that his "advisor told [him] that it is better enroll in this class," although he did not indicate why his advisor thought this section would be better.

Another student said that he'd "heard from the former students [to enroll in the international-only section]."

While this indicates that both former students and advisors are recommending the international-only sections to international students, it's not clear why these recommendations are being made. Previous students who make the recommendation may have had a good experience in the class and believed that it would be beneficial to other international students. Advisors, who may or may not be familiar with the challenges of L2 writers, may be recommending these sections simply because students are international students. If advisors and students are making these recommendations based on their understanding of the difference between the enrollment options and their understanding of why a student may choose one instructional setting over another, then these could be considered well-informed recommendations. However, if students or advisors are making these recommendations simply because they believe international students should take a class specifically for international students rather than exploring the options with the student, it's possible that the international-only section may not always be the best fit. Further study could indicate what benefits recommenders see to the international-only sections, or, as in the case of advisors, what their understanding is of the difference between the two options.

The remaining category for choice of international-only sections was related to the students' perceived comfort level of these sections. Fourteen percent of students responded that they enrolled in the international-only sections because they felt more comfortable in these sections. One student said that he believed that he "will be comfortable with students who are the same as me (English is not their first language)." Another student said that she believed that an "environment with other international students would be fun and more comfortable." Research

has indicated that international students tend to feel uncomfortable in mainstream classes and, when given a choice, often prefer to work with other NNSE rather than NSE (Harklau, 1994; Braine, 1994B; Ibrahim & Penfield, 2005). A more thorough discussion of comfort level in the classroom is discussed in the section below.

Although students had clear reasons for their choice to enroll in the international-only sections, some students expressed concern about their chosen instructional setting. Specifically, eleven students (61%) reported that they had some concerns about being in an international-only section. The largest concern of students enrolled in international-only sections (33%) was related to communication difficulties. Communication difficulties identified by the students included difficulties with their own ability to communicate as well as their ability to understand the instructor of the course and other students enrolled in the course. Some students simply responded that they were concerned about "communication problems." However, other students provided more details about their communication concerns. For example, one student said that "maybe I cannot understand what the teacher says and express my ideas smoothly with them." Another student said that "when [we] communicate with each other (…) I will not understand their non-standard pronunciation."

Since the course can include a lot of group work during class, being able to communicate with other students in the class is important. Students who may have only had classes in their home country, with a teacher and other students who have similar accents in English, could find it difficult to understand students or an instructor who has a different accent than they do. This bears further research to determine if this is a concern that should be considered in international-only sections.

Other students (17%) were concerned that they would not learn as much from international students as they would from American students in a mainstream class. For example, one student commented that "I cannot learn from them as much as if they are American." Another student was concerned about the difference in benefits related to peer review between an international-only section and a mainstream class. "Getting peer reviews—may not be as helpful as asking from a native English speaker." Another student was concerned that she would not improve her English as she might in a mainstream class, stating that, "people speak their mother language instead of English with people coming from the same country. It's hard to improve English then." These concerns echo some of the research that suggests students enrolled in international-only sections may miss out on opportunities such as authentic language practice with NSE or seeing examples of writing conventions from NNSE papers (Healy & Hall, 1994; Matsuda & Silva, 1999). Although international students may choose to enroll in an international-only section because of potential benefits they foresee, it's clear that they are also aware of the possible benefits of working with NSE.

Perceived comfort level in the classroom. Responses that addressed the comfort level of international students in the classroom came from seven Likert-scale statements from the survey. Descriptive statistics from these questions present a general sense of comfort among students in the international-only sections of CO150 (see Table 4).

In general, international students who enrolled in international-only CO150 classes felt comfortable working with other students in the classroom and asking the instructor for further clarification when they didn't understand something. They felt that they were a valued part of the class and that their class had a friendly and welcoming atmosphere. They also preferred to have an instructor who was familiar with their culture. This preference corresponds with a large

percentage (22%) of students who indicated that having an instructor who was familiar with cultural differences and the writing challenges that international students may face was a main reason for enrolling in an international-only section.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Select Survey Questions Relating to Comfort Level in the Classroom

Survey Question	Mean	St. Dev.
1. I feel comfortable working/talking with other international students in the class.	3.22	0.55
3. I feel comfortable asking the instructor questions during class, in front of other students in the class.	3.17	0.71
7. If I don't understand something the instructor says, I feel comfortable asking other student in the class for help.	3.28	0.57
8. I think the atmosphere of my class is friendly and welcoming.*	3.52	0.52
11. I feel comfortable showing my writing to my classmates.	3.17	0.62
13. I prefer to have an instructor who is familiar with my culture.	3.44	0.70
16. I feel that my opinions and thoughts are valued in this class.	3.28	0.67

Note. *n=17

Students indicated that they generally felt comfortable asking the instructor questions in class in front of other students. One student who was interviewed said he was comfortable with this because "we [the students] are all at the same level [of English and writing], so we don't feel embarrassed or need to worry about saying something wrong." However, most students who were interviewed stated that they would prefer to ask the instructor questions during office hours rather than during class. One student commented that he preferred to wait until office hours to ask his instructor questions because he worried that "my questions might just be time wasting and I'm scared to ask the question [in class] because of the limited time." Another student said that sometimes her questions led to more questions and in office hours her instructor could "answer all the questions (…) and give more information." Although they preferred to ask questions outside of class, all the students who were interviewed indicated that they felt

comfortable asking their instructor questions and talking with them both during class as well as during office hours; they simply preferred the latter if given the choice.

Students also indicated that they felt comfortable working with other international students. Many of the students who were interviewed contrasted this feeling of comfort in the international-only sections with how they believed they would feel working with NSE students. One student indicated that "I felt comfortable working with other [international] students. I'm in other classes with [NSE] students (…) and I haven't worked with them yet, but I think it will be stressful and I am already worried about it." Another student also commented, "I'm not comfortable [working with NSE] because I would probably speak poorly (…) if I worked in pairs."

Research has shown that international students may find ways of avoiding working with NSE in composition classes, may feel uncomfortable working with NSE in groups, or contributing to class discussions (Harklau, 1994; Ibrahim & Penfield, 2005; Hsieh, 2007). Enrolling in a class with all NNSE is one way for international students to avoid working with NSE and feel more comfortable in their classroom. Providing international students the option to enroll in an international-only class gives them the opportunity to feel comfortable working with other students and to contribute to class and group discussions that they may not experience in their other university classes.

Fulfillment of needs. Responses that addressed the fulfillment of needs in international-only sections came from thirteen Likert-scale statements on the survey. Fulfillment of needs related to how well students thought they were learning in their classes, whether they understood classroom communication, whether they felt that they were receiving benefits from activities such as peer review, and whether they thought their writing had improved. Fulfillment of needs

also addressed whether students could see a change in their writing and make connections between writing in CO150 and their other classes.

In general, international students in international-only sections indicated that they believed that their needs were met (see Table 5). Students reported that they understood their instructors' lectures and directions for class work and assignments. They also believed that their instructor understood their questions and was able to answer them. Finally, they believed that their instructor paid as much attention to them as to the other students in the class. One area in which students did not think their needs were being met was with respect to learning better in a class with NSE or NNSE. Most students indicated that they did not learn as well in a classroom of other international students compared to native English speakers. This corresponds with the 17% of students who were concerned with their enrollment choice because they felt they might not learn as much from other international students.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Select Survey Questions Relating to Perception of Needs Fulfillment

Survey Questions	Mean	St. Dev.
2. I think I learn better when I work with other international students rather than native English speaking students.	2.89	0.68
4. When I ask my instructor questions, he/she understands what I am asking and is able to answer my question(s).	3.61	0.50
5. During lectures, I am able to understand what my instructor is saying.	3.50	0.51
6. When my instructor gives directions for class work and assignments, I understand what he/she is asking me to do.	3.61	0.50
9. During peer workshop, it is easy for me to comment on the writing of my classmates.*	3.36	0.67
10. During peer workshop, I think that my classmates make comments that are helpful in my revisions.*	2.82	0.87
18. I feel that this class is adequately preparing me for writing in other college classes.*	3.45	0.69
19. I understand the expectations in this class. That is, I understand what I need to do in order to do well in this class.	3.50	0.62
20. I understand what constitutes as plagiarism.	3.39	0.61

Note. *n=11

Another area in which students indicated they were not satisfied was related to peer review. Although students felt that they were able to respond to their classmates' papers, they did not feel that their classmates provided helpful comments for their future revisions. One student commented that,

> Sometimes you work with someone who is not really sure what's going on (…). But if you're working with a partner who is working on their homework and [assignments] (…) and they know what is going on, then workshops are really good and you get good help.

Another student also felt that not everyone was good at commenting on papers. He stated that "forty percent [of students] sit there and do nothing and make no comments or [poor comments]." Research into NNSE experiences in workshop have identified that students often believe that there is a range in the value of student responses during peer review, especially when students are new to peer review (Sadler, 2004).

Although in any classroom, mainstream or international-only, there are bound to be students who, for various reasons, are not as familiar with the expectations of an assignment, it is important to ensure that students have an understanding of the expectations of workshop. If students are not responding to other students' drafts effectively, it might be worth investing class time into specific instructions on how to perform a peer review during workshop. Hu (2005) found that only with extensive trainings on the benefits and challenges of workshops, the ways in which to respond to writing, and the appropriate procedures to follow when reviewing another student's paper were NNSE able to provide consistently appropriate and helpful responses during peer review. Although Hu (2005) found that this required a lot of in-class explanation and training, if peer review is to be used in the classroom, such steps may be necessary, especially for NNSE who may be unfamiliar or uncomfortable with commenting on a fellow student's paper.

Students also indicated that they believed that their writing had changed as a result of CO150. Since some students completed the survey towards the beginning of a semester, only 11 students (out of 18) responded to questions and statements on the survey that related to the different ways in which they felt that their writing had changed. Of the students who answered the questions, no one indicated that they believed that their writing had neither improved nor changed and many offered a number of ways in which their writing had changed.

Of the 11 students that felt that their writing had changed and/or improved, four were unable to explain how their writing had improved, but felt that it had. The remaining responses could be grouped into two categories, with three remaining responses that could not be grouped. The first category related to learning how to write a paper for a university classes. One student commented that, "I know how to write a American university paper now," while another said "I know how to write a essay correctly for [university] classes." The second category was related to rules and methods of writing for an American academic audience. One student stated, "I know more rules and methods of writing that can help me (…)" Another student said that, "I learn the importance of citation." Two student responses did not fit into the above categories. One student commented that, "I know more about different genres." The other response indicated that the student's "writing speed is more fast."

Results also indicated that students understood what they needed to do in order to succeed in the class. Most students who were interviewed indicated that in order to do well, they needed to follow the rubric for each major assignment, listen to class lectures, and improve their writing. For example, one student said that her instructor "lists out all of the things [we need to do] on the grading sheets [rubric] and I will do well [if I follow those things]." Beyond that, she believed that her writing was expected to have a "clear claim or main point, and do you have

enough supporting points for it. I think that's what important because if you don't have enough support then your claim is not convincing." Making this connection may be especially important for international students, as research has indicated that NNSE often struggle with providing adequate support for argument structures in academic writing (Silva, 1993).

The same student indicated that she understood that her writing needed to change from the way she wrote papers in Taiwan, specifically that,

> The writing style is different [in the U.S.]; you need to be really direct (...) I feel like [in Taiwan] (…) you make the reader do the thinking, but then [my instructor] always says that here you have to be really direct because they [instructors and American audience] don't necessarily have time for your old style.

This statement suggests that she was beginning to understand the differences in reader expectations between Taiwanese and English, moving from a "reader responsible" to "writer responsible" rhetorical structure (Hinds, 1987), something that many international-only section instructors spend class time discussing.

Another student indicated that her instructor expected her "to improve writing between assignments." She explained, however, that this had not been the case for her between her first and second assignment. She said that,

> I wanted to improve from assignment to assignment, but on the second assignment, everything dropped. I didn't do well because there were no examples. I think it was [a] new [assignment]. Other assignments had examples, but there was no example for this one. I think it [the second assignment] wasn't clear. I used the examples to do well and understand expectations of the other assignments.

This type of response may indicate that some international students do well by looking at past examples of student assignments so that they can model their assignment after previous students' assignments. CO150 instructors (in both international-only and mainstream classes) typically provide examples from previous semesters as models for current students. If an instructor decides to include an assignment that has not been used before, it might be beneficial to provide examples from outside sources. These texts could still act as a model for students who are unfamiliar with certain genres that are presented in CO150. Considering that many IEPs may teach writing that is different from writing expectations in college composition class, as indicated by Ramanathan and Atkinson (1995), providing international students with examples of the genres they are expected to write in may help them be more successful. Since students may be writing in a genre that is unfamiliar to them, examples could provide a guide for the expected organization, content, and register of the genre.

In general, results from the survey indicated that students believed that CO150 had prepared them for writing expectations in their other university courses. Results from individual interviews, however, indicated a mixed view on the adequacy of CO150 in fulfilling additional writing needs. Every student who was interviewed agreed that learning specific citation formats was helpful and that they could apply that knowledge to other classes. One student commented that "learning citation was helpful because I didn't know it before. In China, citation is not as formal. Learning MLA was important and I can then understand APA, too." Another student, from Taiwan, commented that MLA style was important to learn since other classes require some kind of citation. Because of the differences in expectations between citations in their home country and the U.S., students felt that this was an important aspect to learn and felt that they had

been adequately taught how to properly cite for an American audience, regardless of whether their other classes used APA or MLA format.

With regard to specific writing tasks performed in university classes outside of CO150, two of the interviewed students believed that CO150 had taught them how to write texts for these classes, while two other students found that CO150 was lacking in some areas. One student, a math major, saw the applicability of CO150 to classes outside of her major:

> I do not do much writing outside of CO150 for math. Except for my music appreciation class (…) The most helpful assignment [in CO150] was the argument essay. It's similar to writing in music appreciation. Learning in CO150 helped me with the structure.

Another student said that although the writing in CO150 was different from writing for her other classes, she was able to take concepts from CO150 and apply them to other contexts:

> I did a couple papers for my biology class for a lab report. I did two papers for sociology class. We need to use a lot of summary (…) in my lab reports. I need to summarize what is the purpose of the whole experiment and my sociology paper we have to do summary as well. I found that [learning summary skills in CO150 was] very helpful.

In contrast, two other students felt that they were unable to use skills taught in CO150 to specific types of writing outside of the composition classroom. Although both students weren't able to see the application of specific types of writing in CO150, they had very different attitudes. One student still felt that CO150 had improved his writing skills in general although he did not see a direct connection to the writing in his current content classes. This student, who was currently taking mostly science and math classes commented that,

> I don't do much writing [outside of CO150]. I just have sciences and math. I have to write lab reports. And I think it's very different from [the writing in] CO150, so CO150

> doesn't really teach you how to do the science writing. I think it [CO150] is better for the Humanities, but not for science.

When asked, however, whether he thought that science majors should be required to take CO150 or if there should be a CO150 specifically for science majors, he replied that he believed CO150 was a necessary basic writing course and that higher level composition courses could fill the needs for genre specific writing skills. Overall, he saw a use for CO150, as it helped him to "learn to write more American."

The final student who was interviewed felt that the writing in CO150 was not applicable to writing in other classes and had not helped make her a better writer. When asked if she could make connections between writing in CO150 and her other classes, she commented that,

> I think they are separate between the two. Argument writing was the closest. In history, we had to write a paper, but it wasn't an argument and there was no counterargument. We just had to express ourselves. We didn't do that in CO150, it was more structured.

When asked if CO150 had helped improve her writing in general, this student expressed frustration throughout most of her interview because of her perception that CO150 had not improved her writing. Specifically, she commented that,

> I started CO150 in my second year. I already had experience writing in other classes. I had to learn how to write from those classes and the comments I got on those papers. It was difficult, but I learned and I finally got good grades on those papers, so I don't think CO150 had much impact on my writing after that.

She commented that as a result of her experience, she wished she had enrolled in the mainstream section of CO150 because she thought it might have been more challenging and would have improved her writing more than the international-only section.

There was at least one salient difference between the students who were able to make connections between CO150 and writing in other classes, and the student who felt that CO150 was not helpful, which might provide an explanation into their different reactions. The first three students, who saw the applicability of the skills and experiences they had in CO150 to other classes, all took CO150 in their first semester at CSU. The student who was frustrated with her experience, in contrast, took CO150 during her third semester and already had experience writing in American classrooms. As she commented, she had learned how to write papers well by learning from her mistakes in earlier papers and applying what she had learned from them to future assignments. In this way, she felt that she was already successful with writing in content classes before she had enrolled in an international-section of CO150.

Their experiences and resulting perceptions of CO150 suggest that international students should be required to take their writing course in their first semester, or at least their first year, at the university. Requiring international students to take a writing course the first semester they are eligible may help reduce their struggles in content classes as well as help them to apply the writing skills that they learn to writing that they do outside of the composition classroom.

In addition to their perception of the applicability of skills learned in CO150, students who were interviewed were also asked if they believed that they received enough support in CO150, both inside and outside of the classroom. Students reported that they received a lot of support in the classroom and that the additional support they sought and used adequately addressed their needs. Most students used the Writing Center to varying degrees. One student used the Writing Center for each major assignment and thought it was generally helpful, although she was frustrated that each session only lasted 30 minutes and that Writing Center tutors were not always familiar with her assignments. Another student commented that he would

always recommend the Writing Center to his international friends instead of asking someone else (i.e. another student or NSE) to look over an assignment because "they [Writing Center staff members] are professionals, or a kind of professional and know what they are looking for."

Responses indicate that, in general, international students in international-only sections believed that their needs are being met within the classroom with regards to understanding expectations, receiving enough support, and seeing applicability of writing in CO150 to writing in other contexts. However, interviews did indicate the need for improvement in the areas of addressing writing needs within the wider context of the university as well as providing examples for all assignments.

Preferred enrollment option. The final question on the survey asked students to consider what they believed would be the ideal instructional setting for a composition class: 1) all native speakers of English, 2) all non-native speakers of English, or 3) half native speakers of English and half non-native speakers of English. The majority of students (77%) responded that they would prefer to enroll in a class that was half NSE and half NNSE, while only 11% would prefer a class of all NNSE. One student indicated a preference for a class of all NSE.

Choices for enrollment and concerns of their choice of enrollment in international-only sections may help indicate why a majority of students would ultimately prefer a composition class with half NSE and half NNSE. With NSE classmates, NNSE could gain some of the benefits they think they are missing out on, such as having a NSE as a partner during peer review or being able to improve their English. A class that has NSE, but also contains a large group of international students, and an instructor who is familiar with international student struggles in L2 writing could provide a balance between student concerns of international-only sections and their reasons for choosing to enroll in an international-only section. As Matsuda and Silva (1999)

indicated, mixed composition classes can provide an atmosphere that is less threatening than mainstream classes and is beneficial for international student language and composition improvement.

Experiences of International Students in Mainstream Classes

Based on survey results, international students who enrolled in mainstream sections of CO150 had a variety of reasons for their enrollment choice, tended to feel comfortable in the classroom, and felt that CO150 met their needs. Reasons for students' enrollment choice, their comfort level in the classroom, perception of fulfillment of needs, and preferred instructional setting are discussed below.

Choice of instructional setting. International students chose to enroll in mainstream sections of CO150 for a variety of reasons. Students who were aware that they had a choice of instructional setting listed a number of reasons for choosing to enroll in mainstream sections. Three main categories for their choice were identified, with four reasons that were not easily categorized (see Table 6).

Table 6

Reasons for Enrollment in Mainstream Sections

Reason	N[a]	Percentage[b]
Challenge self	5	50%
Drawbacks of international-only sections	3	30%
Benefits of mainstream sections	2	20%
No reason given	1	10%
Misc./Uncategorizable	4	40%

Note. [a]N higher than participants because some gave more than one response
[b]Percentage higher than 100% due to multiple responses

The largest category (50%) indicated that students wanted to challenge themselves by enrolling in a mainstream class. For example, one student wrote that, "I felt like my English was sufficient enough to enter a course with others whose first language is English," while another

student wanted "[to] be graded as native." Students seemed to believe that the mainstream classes were more challenging than the international-only sections, because they were being compared with NSE, especially with grading and their writing level. These results support the idea that students who feel that their writing ability and English proficiency are on par with NSE tend to enroll in mainstream classes so that they are in a composition class with students "like them" (Costino & Hyon, 2007). Also, if their English proficiency and L1 writing ability are high, they may be able to combine those skills to do well in a class with NSE (Cummings, 1989).

Two additional categories addressed the perceived benefits of the mainstream class and the perceived drawbacks of the international-only sections. Perceived benefits of the mainstream class included one student who indicated that in working with NSE "my writing skills will improve." One student believed that mainstream classes were a way to improve his English, stating that "I want to improve my English with native speakers." Another student saw international-only sections as an impediment to improving English and therefore wanted to be in a mainstream class, stating that, "(…) there are always lots of mother tongues in int'l only sections rather than English being spoken." A student who was interviewed expressed a similar sentiment:

> Last semester I took CO130 and there were a lot of Chinese students and other international students [in my class]. I have a bad feeling that everyone speaks Chinese. I'm taking an English class, so it's not good for me to speak Chinese (…) I think I will make more progress [in English and writing] in a mainstream class than in an international-only one.

Four students indicated that they were not aware that there were CO150 sections for international students. Two of these students indicated that if they had known, they would have

enrolled in them. One student stated that she would have enrolled in the international-only section “because the teacher probably teaches in another way.” Two of these students indicated that if they had known about the international-only sections, they still would have chosen to enroll in the mainstream classes. The responses from these four students indicate that there may be a need for providing additional information about the enrollment options for international students.

One reason some students may be unaware of the international-only sections may be because they don’t self-identify as a NNSE on their placement exam. One student indicated that when he enrolled in CO150, he was not aware that he could have enrolled in an international-only section. He said that he had not self-identified as a NNSE on his exam because he had wanted his writing to be assessed with NSE’s writing. Despite the fact that all placements exams are evaluated by the same raters, international students may not be aware of this and choose not to self-identify so that they are rated alongside NSE. Ensuring that international students understand that their exams are evaluated with NSE may encourage more students to self-identify on the placement exam. This would increase the chances that they would be contacted about their options when enrolling in CO150. It is important that they are aware of this so that they can decide which instructional setting might best suit their needs.

Despite their choice to enroll in a mainstream class, most students (79%) expressed some concerns about being enrolled in a class with mostly (or all) NSE. Over half of the international students enrolled in mainstream classes (64%) identified some type of concern about communication in the classroom. This category could be further divided into two subcategories, those related to understanding (whether they could understand NSE and vice versa) and communication during class discussions. One student commented that “my concern is that my

English isn't good enough and that people will have a hard time understanding me." Another student worried that he would have "difficulties in understanding what others are talking about because they speak faster than international students."

In addition to general communication concerns, some students were worried about communication specifically during group discussions in the class. One student thought that "during discussions, they [NSE] might not talk to me as much as they do to Americans, cuz they probably assume I don't understand as much as they do." Another student expressed similar concerns with communication during small group discussions:

> I feel embarrassed about discussions. If you have two group members that are native speakers, they talk to each other but not to me. You can't catch up with them. But if they will direct comments to me, it will be better. I don't mind talking with them, but they make it hard. Their voice when they talk with Americans, it's lower and faster, hard to follow. If they talk to foreigners, they will slow down, but they usually talk to each other.

Many studies have observed that international students tend to stay silent during group work or discussions and may feel "silenced" by their NSE counterparts (Hsieh, 2007, p.384), but that they would like to contribute to group discussions (Braine, 1996). As Hsieh (2007) indicated, instructors may want to consider assigning specific roles to students during group work so that everyone must contribute, although Harklau (1994) observed that even when assigned a certain role during group work, international students would sometimes return to their own desks to work alone. This may be because, even when assigned a certain role, NSE students unaccustomed to working with NNSE may be unaware that they are speaking at a rate that makes contribution difficult for NNSE, as indicated in this study. Instructors in mainstream classes may want to consider doing more pair work than group work, as this may allow international students

more opportunities to engage in a discussion if their NSE partner does not have another NSE to work with.

Two other additional concerns were identified. Some students (14%) were concerned about the vocabulary of the class; one student commented that her biggest concern was "vocabulary-that I don't understand words and meanings that are important." International students' struggles with vocabulary is something that instructors should be aware of, as one study showed that when NNSE encounter a new vocabulary word during a lecture or in-class discussion they can lose track of the topic that is being discussed and "get stuck" on the unknown word (Mendelsohn, 2002, p.68). Instructors may want to ensure that they are explaining any context specific words so that international students can follow lectures.

Another student was concerned about being an "outsider" in the classroom. She wrote that her biggest concern was that "I view myself as an outsider because I am from another country, have totally different backgrounds and may share different interests with [NSE]." This reinforces Harklau's (1994) study, which indicated that NNSE may feel uncomfortable with NSE because they feel like they have little in common with NSE. These feelings often cause international students to feel isolated in classes of all NSE (Braine, 1994b). Despite the fact that integration of NSE into mainstream classes has been ongoing, problems identified almost two decades ago still exist in the classroom. Some suggestions and discussion for addressing this problem are offered in the discussion of instructor perceptions and experiences below.

Perceived Comfort Level in the Classroom. Responses that addressed the respective comfort level of international students in their sections of CO150 came from eight Likert-scale statements from the survey. Results indicated that international students enrolled in mainstream classes generally felt comfortable in their classes, with some exceptions (see Table 7).

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Select Survey Questions Relating to Comfort Level in the Classroom

Survey Question	Mean	St. Dev.
1. I feel comfortable working/talking with English speaking students in the class in pairs or groups.	3.00	0.68
3. I feel comfortable asking the instructor questions during class, in front of native English speaking students in the class.	2.64	0.93
7. If I don't understand something the instructor says, I feel comfortable asking a native English speaking student in the class for help.	3.21	0.70
8. I think the atmosphere of my class is friendly and welcoming.	3.50	0.52
13. I prefer to have an instructor who is familiar with my culture.	2.22	0.80
16. I feel that my opinions and thoughts are valued in this class.	3.07	0.58

International students enrolled in mainstream classes indicated that their classes had a friendly and welcoming atmosphere. They felt comfortable working with English speaking students in the class, in pairs or in groups and they felt comfortable asking NSE students questions if they didn't understand the instructor. Students also felt that their thoughts and opinions were valued. Additionally, international students enrolled in mainstream classes did not feel that their instructor needed to be familiar with their culture.

There were, however, a few areas that international students indicated that they felt uncomfortable. For example, students indicated that they didn't feel comfortable asking their instructor questions in front of other NSE classmates. One student commented that he felt comfortable asking the instructor questions,

> (…) outside of class. I would follow her and ask her after class or in office hours. I don't want to ask in class (…) because maybe the question is not simple, it takes time, and could delay the class. I don't want to delay the class just for myself.

Although students indicated on the survey that they felt comfortable working in pairs or groups with NSE, this seems to contradict the 64% who commented that communication was one of their biggest concerns, especially during group work. There could be a few explanations for

this. Students may be considering different situations in their answers, one in which they feel comfortable, such as working with other classmates they know well, and one in which they feel uncomfortable, such as a large group discussion with students they don't know well. For example, one student who was interviewed explained that she was comfortable working and talking with specific classmates who she worked with frequently throughout the semester, but would probably not talk voluntarily with other classmates or feel as comfortable working with them in pairs or groups:

> I feel comfortable working with my regular partners. They include me in the discussion and I got to know them. But otherwise, I wouldn't talk with other students or want to work with them. I feel comfortable [with my regular partners], but (…) once I finish an activity, I have nothing to talk about with students I don't know well.

This response partly reflects the observations in previous studies, such as Braine (1994b) and Harklau (1994), where international students often felt like they had nothing in common with other students. However, it also offers some insight into what kind of situations NNSE may be comfortable. Allowing international students to work with partners they feel more comfortable with may allow them to build a relationship with those students and encourage them to participate more. Although it's important to allow students to work with a variety of partners, it may be beneficial for instructors in mainstream classes to ensure that international students are able to work with other students that they feel comfortable with on a somewhat regular basis.

Fulfillment of needs. Fulfillment of needs addressed whether students thought their enrollment option provided them with the best learning atmosphere, provided a clear understanding of instructor communication, and provided benefits during peer review. How well

students were able to understand classroom and writing expectations and how well they felt the course addressed their writing needs were also addressed.

In general, international students felt that their writing needs were met by CO150 (see Table 8). They thought that they learn better in a class with NSE classmates rather than a class with only international students. They believed that their instructor was able to answer their questions and they understood their instructors during lectures and when giving instructions. In addition, they thought that the instructor paid as much attention to them as to their NSE counterparts in the class.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Select Survey Questions Relating to Fulfillment of Needs

Survey Question	Mean	St. Dev.
4. When I ask my instructor questions, he/she understands what I am asking and is able to answer my question(s).	3.50	0.52
6. When my instructor gives directions for class work and assignments, I understand what he/she is asking us to do.	3.54	0.57
9. During peer workshop, it is easy for me to comment on the writing of my native English speaking classmates. *	3.00	1.07
10. During peer workshop, I think that my native English speaking classmates make comments that are helpful for my revisions.*	3.38	0.52
21. I understand what constitutes as plagiarism.	3.43	0.62

Note. *n=9

Survey results indicated that students understood the class theme of their mainstream class; however some students who were interviewed expressed difficulty with the class theme "Ethics in Higher Education." One student stated that, "I had to learn a lot about it [problems in higher education] to understand the same things my classmates did (…) I didn't know much about the cost [of higher education] or other problems, but I learned." Another student said, "I don't have a background in it [issues in higher education]. Honestly, I'm not that interested in it, but I know (…) I will have to learn more." This particular class theme focuses on current events that are culturally specific to an American context, which often places NNSE at a disadvantage

when compared to their NSE counterparts (Braine, 1994a). Instructors in mainstream classes need to be aware of this possible gap and could provide additional background information on specific topics within a class theme in the form of newspaper articles or internet sites that provide an overview of a certain topic or issue.

Survey results also indicated that students felt that peer reviews were helpful. Results from individual interviews, however, presented a mixed view. A Chinese student indicated that he wasn't comfortable commenting on his classmates' papers. He explained that he didn't "know how to comment on their writing. I don't like to say if their writing is good or bad (because) I am learning, too." Research has indicated that students from some cultural backgrounds, such as China, may find it more difficult than others to comment on others' writing, feeling that they do not have the authority to do so (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 2006). Mainstream instructors should be aware of these cultural differences as it could cause problems during peer review. A more thorough discussion of difficulties with peer review in this context is provided in the discussion section on instructor experiences.

Students also indicated that they believed that their writing had changed and improved as a result of the class. Fifty percent of students felt their writing had changed with regards to their writing structure or organization. One student responded that his writing had become more "concise and clear," while another student said that she learned to "write more academically." Two students indicated that their writing had changed from a "reader responsible" to "writer responsible" style of writing as identified by Hinds (1987). For example, one student said "writing here requires a lot more explanation [than in Malaysia]. Even if it's common sense, I still need to talk about it. At home, I don't need as much elaboration. My reader can figure it out."

Students who were interviewed also indicated that they found learning about citation beneficial. A Chinese student commented,

> MLA citation is new for me. In China I didn't have to be specific about my citations. I wrote a paper for a political science class [before learning citation practices in CO150] and I didn't use good citation; I got a low mark. The instructor didn't tell us about it, just expected us to know. I think it's very important, especially for foreigners, to learn about citation because we don't learn it at home.

All three students who were interviewed commented on the importance of learning specific citation practices, contrasting them to the lack of citation practices in their home country. Considering that university instructors will expect that students understand the expectation of citation in the American university classroom, this type of instruction is beneficial for students, especially international students who have not had previous experiences with citation or have not received explicit instruction on citation practices (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005).

Students who were interviewed indicated that they felt that they had enough support in the classroom and rarely used outside support. None of the interviewed students had used the Writing Center while in CO150. One student commented that he had planned to use the Writing Center, but didn't because he felt "confident" in his writing ability in English. Another student said that "my [peer review] partners were really good and helped in reviewing my papers." She indicated that she would consider going to the Writing Center in the future "for classes that don't have peer review so someone can look at my paper before I turn it in." Research has shown that some NNSE enrolled in mainstream composition often classes find that the reviews they receive in-class are enough so that they may not feel that they need to seek outside resources when composing (Sadler, 2004).

Results also indicated that students believed that the writing they did in CO150 was applicable to writing outside of the composition classroom, even if they had not yet had the experience of using those skills in other contexts. One student commented that he had to do a lab report and with the "background of CO150, it turned out not to be difficult. I could use summary and organization skills from CO150 for the report." Another student felt that CO150 would be helpful, although he hadn't used any of the skills yet:

> Altogether, everything is useful, but I haven't taken advantage of it yet. Learned it very late in the semester. I think I will benefit more in additional future semesters when I can use my skills. My papers [written before CO150] would be better if I wrote now.

One student indicated that the writing in CO150 was similar to the writing that she had learned to do at INTO, but that it was "a step up" from that writing. She said that for her content classes, CO150:

> Prepared me to include sources when writing, but otherwise it's very different. For example, my writing in Economics is very different and the writing for Sociology 205 is completely different because it's opinion style. It's more free style [than the writing in CO150]. I had to ask the teacher for an example because I didn't know how to do it. I first wrote the paper and then asked the teacher about it, that was when she gave me the example because what I had written was not what she was looking for.

Although this student thought that the types of texts she was writing for CO150 and her other classes were different, she also believed that CO150 had made her writing "more polished" and thought that this would make her a better writer in her other classes.

Preferred enrollment option. When asked what type of composition classroom they preferred from a choice of a class of all native English speakers, all non-native English speakers,

or half native-English speakers and half non-native speakers, no student enrolled in a mainstream class indicated that they would prefer a class of all NNSE. The majority of students (62%) preferred a class of all NSE while some would have preferred a class of half NNSE and half NSE (38%).

This high percentage of students who indicated that their preferred instructional setting was that of their actual instructional setting most likely indicates that students are satisfied with their choice. Those who indicated that they might prefer a class of half NSE and half NNSE may indicate that students see some benefits of being enrolled in a class with other NNSE, although they were not asked for their reason(s) for their indication of instructional setting preference.

Comparison of Student Experiences

A comparison of results indicates that international students in the two instructional settings tend to have similar experiences overall, but there are some differences in specific aspects. Some of these differences may help to explain why a student chose one context over the other and can provide valuable information when helping students decide which section may be the most appropriate instructional setting for them.

One similarity between students in mainstream and international-only sections is their perception of the level of challenge of the mainstream section compared to the international-only sections. Both groups indicated that they believed that the mainstream class was more challenging. What differed was their response to that perceived difference; those who wanted the challenge enrolled in the mainstream class, those who did not chose an international-only section. What is not clear from these results, however, is if students in both groups are thinking of the same challenge(s). Most students in the international-only sections did not indicate what the perceived challenge was. On the other hand, many students in the mainstream class related

the challenge to being judged with NSE as well as their belief of their high level of writing ability in English. Students in the mainstream section may be comfortable with their writing being assessed at a native level, whereas those in the international-only sections stated that they wanted an instructor who was aware of the mistakes international students may make in their writing. When making recommendations as to placement options for international students, it may be worth exploring their perceptions of their writing ability and their level of comfort in being assessed with NSE. Those who have a high confidence level in their writing ability may do well being assessed in a mainstream class whereas those who are less confident in their ability may do well in an international-only section where they are not self-confident about the mistakes they make.

Students in both sections also have concerns about their chosen instructional setting, although a higher percentage of students in mainstream sections indicated that they had concerns than did those enrolled in international-only sections (79% to 61%). The biggest concern of students in both instructional settings was related to communication issues. A related concern in the mainstream section was that of vocabulary, which may be better handled in the international-only sections, since one of the students interviewed indicated how much she appreciated her instructor's willingness to stop and explain words that she thought students might not understand.

Responses from both groups indicated that there were students who were unaware that a different instructional setting existed apart from the one in which they were enrolled. For those in the international-only sections, it appeared that some students believed that they had to enroll in the international-only sections, and for those in the mainstream classes, it seemed they are unaware of the international-only sections. Within the group of those who were unaware of a

different option only a few indicated that they would have chosen differently. It would be worth investigating where the miscommunication lies, whether it's advisors who are unaware of the different options or a misunderstanding on the part of international students who think that when they check the "ESL" section on the placement exam they must enroll in an international-only section. Ensuring that all international students are aware of their enrollment options can help ensure that they are able to choose the setting that is most appropriate for their comfort level and needs and expectations of a composition course.

International students indicated that they generally felt comfortable in their respective instructional setting. Overall, students in both sections indicated that they thought that their classrooms were welcoming and friendly and the results from the other questions relating to comfort help support that perception. Students in both sections felt comfortable working with other students in the class whether it's other international students in the international-only sections or NSE in the mainstream classes. Similarly, students in both sections felt comfortable asking other students in the class questions if they didn't understand something. Students also felt comfortable showing their writing to their classmates in both sections. Finally, students indicated that they felt that their thoughts and opinions are valued in both instructional settings.

Students in the two sections vary with regard to how they felt about having an instructor who is familiar with their culture, but both preferences indicated comfort in their respective classes. Students who chose to enroll in international-only sections indicated that they preferred to have an instructor who was familiar with their culture, whereas students enrolled in mainstream classes indicated that they were not particularly concerned with having an instructor who was familiar with their culture. Responses from reasons for enrollment indicate that part of the preference for enrolling in an international-only section is the opportunity to have an

instructor who is familiar with writing difficulties of international students. This difference in preference may help indicate why some students decided to enroll in the international-only section rather than a mainstream class; those who want an instructor who is familiar with their culture chose to enroll in an international-only section, those who don't chose to enroll in a mainstream class.

One area where there was a difference in comfort level between the two instructional settings was in regard to asking the instructor questions in front of other classmates. Students in international-only sections indicated that they were comfortable asking the instructor questions in front of other students in the class (M=3.17), whereas students in mainstream classes indicated that they were not comfortable (M=2.64). Means for both sections had relatively high standard deviations, indicating that even within sections there was a range of comfort level for asking questions in front of other students. Whether this observed difference indicates a true difference between sections or is a result of a small sample size is unclear. However, if it is a true representation, as individual interviews seemed to indicate, it could represent one area where international-only sections may be more appropriate for international students, especially if they have questions on in-class assignments or activities. Students who were interviewed from both sections indicated that they felt comfortable asking the instructor questions during office hours and that this was, in fact, their preferred method of asking questions. So, despite their lack of comfort in asking instructors questions during class, it appears that students in both sections are able to find other ways to have their questions addressed.

Like comfort level, students in both sections generally felt that their needs were being met in their respective sections of CO150. Students in both sections felt that they were able to understand their instructors during lectures as well as when they gave directions for assignments.

They also thought that their instructor was able to understand and answer questions that they had. Finally, students believed that their instructor paid equal attention to them as to other students in the class. Although results from students in both sections indicated that their needs in the classroom are generally being met, there were two areas that differed between the instructional settings.

One difference between sections was related to peer review. Students in both sections believed that they were easily able to comment on their peer's drafts during peer workshop, however, students in international-only sections were not as satisfied with the comments they received from their peers as compared to students in mainstream sections. Students in mainstream classes generally agreed that the comments they received during workshop were helpful for their revisions (M=3.38), whereas students in international-only sections tended to disagree with this statement (M=2.82). Since students in mainstream classes mentioned that they believed their English and writing improved as a result of interacting and working with NSE, this may be reflected in their higher level of satisfaction with the comments that they received during peer review. Interviewed students from the international-only sections, however, commented that peer reviews were not always helpful and often depended on how well prepared their partner was. These types of experiences could be reflected in their apparent dissatisfaction in general with comments during peer review.

Students in both contexts commented on the benefit of learning MLA citation in CO150 for future application in other classes. It is interesting to note that every student who commented on MLA citation did so in response to a question regarding plagiarism: their understanding of it and how this concept differed from the concept in their home country. Although citation is certainly a part of understanding (and avoiding) plagiarism, it is not the only part and

understanding how to cite a source properly does not necessarily indicate that a student understands the expectations of academic honesty in the U.S. classroom. Although it does appear that CO150 instructors are providing a unified front as to citation expectations in the U.S. (as Rinnert and Kobayashi (2006) suggest is necessary for international students), there may still be a lack of understanding of the expectations of academic honesty for many international students. This may indicate the need to provide further explanation or clarification on those expectations that go beyond just citation practices, such as doing your own work or clarifying which ideas need to be cited and which do not. East (2006) argues that rather than explaining to students how to avoid plagiarism, instructors often provide examples of inadvertent plagiarism which students may have difficulty learning from. Providing instruction that allows for the discussion of the rhetorical reasons for citation practices in the U.S. rather than just rules to follow may also help clarify academic honesty expectations for international students (Lisa Langstraat, personal communication, February 18, 2014).

Another area in which responses varied between sections was with respect to whether their classroom represented the best learning environment for them. International students in mainstream sections felt that they learned better working with NSE than with NNSE; however students in international-only sections felt that they did not learn as well when working with NNSE than with NSE. This did, however, indicate that most international students believed that they received more benefits from working with NSE than they did in working with all NNSE. Students in international-only sections may like some of the benefits they think they receive from being in an international-only section, such as an instructor who is familiar with some of the struggles international students face in L2 writing and feeling comfortable with other international students, but may feel like they are missing out on some of the benefits of being

enrolled with NSE. This may help to explain why a larger percentage of students in international only sections (78%) would prefer to be enrolled in a composition class that was half NSE and half NNSE, whereas students in mainstream sections had a more equal distribution of preference between all NSE (62%) and half and half (38%). International students who chose to enroll in international-only sections may see a class of half NSE and half NNSE as a way to still feel comfortable in the classroom while also gaining some of the benefits they feel they are losing by not having interactions with NSE. This suggests that it may be beneficial for the composition program to explore the option of offering mixed composition classes so that international students are able to enroll in a classroom in which they feel comfortable, but are also gaining experience in working with NSE.

Experiences of Mainstream Instructors

The experiences of mainstream instructors with enrolled international students are described below. Experiences and perceptions related to comfort level in the classroom, fulfillment of international student needs, and challenges and benefits to having enrolled international students are explored and compared to the results from international students enrolled in mainstream classes. In addition, instructors provided their opinions as to the best instructional option for international students and identified whether they believe they are receiving enough support in teaching international students.

Perceived comfort level in the classroom. Four Likert-scale statements addressed instructor perceptions of international students' level of comfort in their class. Results indicate that instructors do not think that international students are comfortable in the mainstream classroom (see Table 9).

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Select Survey Questions on Perceptions of International Students' Comfort Level

Survey Question	Mean	St. Dev.
1. I think that international students feel comfortable working/talking with native English speaking students in the class in pairs or groups.	2.86	0.64
2. I think that international students feel comfortable asking me questions during class.	2.63	0.74
6. If an international student doesn't understand something I say, I think they feel comfortable asking a native English speaking student for help.	2.38	0.74
7. I think the atmosphere of my classroom is friendly and welcoming for international students.	3.63	0.52

In general, instructors indicated that they believed that international students were not comfortable working with NSE, asking questions during class, or asking a NSE classmate for help. Although they felt that international students were uncomfortable with certain activities within the classroom, all instructors felt that their classroom provided a friendly and welcoming atmosphere for international students.

Instructors' perceptions of student discomfort reinforce students' reported lack of comfort in mainstream classes in some areas, but contrasts in other ways. One way in which it compares to students' report of lack of comfort is with regards to asking questions in front of NSE classmates. Students reported that they were not comfortable and instructor perceptions agree. Students from mainstream classes who were interviewed indicated that they felt comfortable asking questions during office hours and both instructors who were interviewed commented that the international students enrolled in their classes frequently attended office hours. It may be important for instructors to understand that although international students do not ask questions in class, they are still comfortable asking questions in a different context.

Instructors in general indicated that they did not believe that international students felt comfortable working with NSE during pair or group work. One instructor described his observations of a Chinese international student in his class:

> This [pair and group work] was one of [my students'] biggest struggles. I think she felt isolated as the only international student in the class. She never expressed it, but I could tell when I was monitoring group and pair work that she felt like the odd ball out.

This description corresponds, in particular, to the student in the mainstream class who indicated that she felt like an "outsider" in the class as one of her concerns as an international student enrolled in a mainstream class. It appears that instructors of international classes also get a sense that some international students feel isolated or like an "outsider" in a class with NSE.

Another instructor described her perception of the comfort level of international students in the mainstream classroom. She had had four international students in three different CO150 classes and commented that in general, the international students in her classes rarely participated in class or interacted with other students outside of required pair or group work and when they did so they appeared uncomfortable and minimally participated during group activities.

These observations by instructors contradict the students' reported feeling of comfort in working with students from the survey, but reinforce comments that students made in interviews, as well as responses to the open-ended question related to concerns in the mainstream classroom. Although students had reported that they felt comfortable working with NSE classmates, their concerns and responses to interview questions about pair work, group work, and specifically discussions reinforce the observations made by instructors of mainstream classes. These observations also correspond with other observations where instructors and researchers report that NNSE appear uncomfortable when working with NSE (Harklau, 1994; Braine 1994b). As Hsieh (2007) recommends, instructors should be aware that NNSE may be silent or uncomfortable not only because of cultural or personality differences, but because they often feel

silenced by their NSE peers. She further argues that instructors should consider "develop[ing] a supportive atmosphere that can (…) develop American students' open-minded attitudes toward diversity" which may help them be more open in working with and including NNSE in class activities and discussions (p. 388).

With respect to their comfort level in teaching international students, instructors had mixed reactions. Five instructors (62%) said that yes, they were comfortable teaching international students in their composition classes. Their reasons for feeling comfortable fell into two categories: international students were motivated and they were not that different from teaching NSE. One instructor commented that she had only had one international student, but that her experience was "wonderful" and that particular student was interested in both learning and improving her writing skills. She also commented that this student had had "one of the best attitudes" she had encountered in a CO150 student. Another instructor commented that "the challenge of writing in English causes them to be more engaged than some of their fellow [classmates]." In addition to motivation level, one instructor responded that, "besides minor language concerns, I find it not all that different than teaching native speakers."

Three instructors (38%) said that they had some concerns in teaching international students. Their concerns fell into two categories: language concerns and the amount of additional time international students might need. One instructor expressed her concern with language issues stating that at times "there are so many sentence-level errors it's difficult for me to know where to begin, what to address, what not to address, and even how to talk about some things." Another instructor responded that she "sometimes" feels comfortable, but that she doesn't "always feel I can give them the attention they might need."

Instructors' struggles with the needs of international students reinforce Matsuda's (2006a) assertion that composition instructors may be unprepared to deal with the challenges of teaching L2 writers. Composition classes, especially mainstream classes, tend to focus on content of writing rather than mechanics and grammar; instructors who have had little training and/or experience working with L2 writers may struggle to know what to address or how to address it. As Angelova and Riazantseva (1999) pointed out, instructors may be aware of difficulties and problems international students face, but be uncertain with how to deal with them. This suggests that composition instructors may benefit from training that deals with international students' sentence level errors, perhaps through workshops offered through the department.

Fulfillment of student needs. Survey results indicated that most instructors did not think that international students' needs were being met in the mainstream classroom (see Table 10).

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Select Survey Questions Related to Perceptions of Needs Fulfillment

Survey Question	Mean	St. Dev.
3. When international students ask me questions, I understand what they are asking and am able to answer their questions.	3.5	0.53
5. When I give directions for class work and assignments, I think that international students are able to understand what I'm asking them to do.	2.81	0.37
8. During peer workshop, I think it is easy for international students to comment on the writing of their native English speaking classmates.	2.25	0.89
9. During peer workshop, I think that native English speaking students make comments that are helpful for international students to make revisions.	3.00	0.54
11. International students understand what is and what is not plagiarism.	2.75	0.46

Perceptions of fulfillment of needs between instructors and students were similar in two ways. Instructors believed that they were able to understand and address international student questions, which students agreed with. Instructors also believed that NSE classmates make helpful comments on international students' papers during peer review and international students also agreed. These observations and perceptions, however, were where the similarities ended.

International students enrolled in mainstream classes indicated that they understood what constituted plagiarism, however, instructors disagreed. As indicated earlier, international students often equated MLA citation with understanding of plagiarism. International students may think they fully understand MLA citation and therefore, understand plagiarism. Instructors, however, are the ones who identify plagiarism in students' work and must address it so they may have a better idea of whether international students understand the expectations of academic honesty. One instructor discussed her struggles with one international student:

> He had worked hard on the assignment. I struggled with whether or not I had communicated clearly enough the requirements of the assignment and when to cite information. I knew that he didn't know that what he had done was wrong, because he indicated that he didn't realize he was wrong. I could tell that he really didn't understand when he needed to cite information and when he didn't. He did well [on the previous assignment] and I know he knew basic citation format.

This experience and perception of lack of understanding of plagiarism could indicate that regardless of the time spent in class on MLA format, some international students may still struggle with when to cite information, regardless of their understanding of the mechanics and format of citation.

This struggle on the part of the instructor reinforces Ouellette's (2008) concerns for how to handle issues of plagiarism with L2 writers and suggests that it may be beneficial to have a conversation within the composition faculty about dealing with unintentional plagiarism and the best course for dealing with it. This may be especially helpful for mainstream instructors with enrolled international students who may have had little to no experience with the American concept of academic honesty prior to enrollment in CO150. Since reports of plagiarism become

part of a students' permanent record at the university, many instructors struggle with when and in which cases reporting is warranted. If a student, however, has not learned the expectations of academic honesty, the question remains of whether they have met the objectives of CO150 and whether they should advance out of the class (Lisa Langstraat, personal communication, February 18, 2014). Presenting a unified front on both citation practices and repercussions of plagiarism may help to reinforce these concepts and provide international students with a clearer idea of academic honesty expectations in the classroom (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005).

Instructors and students also disagreed with respect to understanding directions in the classroom. Students indicated that they understood instructors' classroom and assignment directions. Instructors, however, believed that international students did not understand their directions during class work or for assignments. As indicated in the "benefits/challenges of instructing international students" section below, at least three instructors felt that international students often did not understand assignments or in-class work as indicated by the students' performance on them and will be discussed in greater detail below.

An additional area of discrepancy was related to commenting on NSE drafts during peer review. International students felt that they were adequately able to comment on their NSE peers' drafts during peer workshop, however, instructors disagreed. One instructor commented that her international students often, "had issues with giving feedback during workshop." She commented that NSE students in her class expressed frustration about the comments they received from NNSE during workshop, saying, "[NSE] students were often unhappy with the feedback they got from international students (…) they said they were unable to clarify what the international student was saying in their comments or that they had provided few comments if any at all."

Another instructor explained the struggle his Chinese student seemed to have with peer workshop, and the observed response from her NSE partners:

> Peer review was difficult for her (…) and took a long time. I could often tell that her mainstream student partner was bored or frustrated because she was taking so long. This was never expressed overtly, but (…) I remember thinking that her partner looked bored and despondent and was probably wondering "why is this person taking so long?"

He also indicated that this type of frustration on the part of the NSE partner was reflected in post-workshop reflections he asked students to write. Although students typically tended to rate other students positively, "mainstream students often commented on how her feedback wasn't very good. On peer review evaluations, mainstream students commented that her work was satisfactory to unsatisfactory." He thought that he should be able to give international students some kind of accommodation because reading the drafts probably takes them longer than it does for a NSE, but he wondered what kind of accommodation you could give, considering the fact that peer review happened in the classroom during class time.

Both instructors expressed concern over the ability of international students to successfully complete peer reviews of NSE drafts. This could have detrimental effects on both NSE and NNSE students in the class. NSE may feel that they don't want to work with NNSE and NNSE, which could affect the performance of NNSE during peer review. Finding ways to ensure that peer review workshops can be beneficial for all students involved is an important way to make sure that the needs of students are being met in the classroom

One possible accommodation to consider would be asking students (both NSE and NNSE) to perform their peer review outside of class, so that students can spend additional time on their peer's assignment if necessary. Hu (2005) reported higher levels of success with this

method than traditional in-class only workshops. He suggests, however, having students first read papers in-class and provide an oral response to writing so that any misunderstandings can be cleared up before a student begins a written response. In this way, instructors may also be able to spend time in class modeling appropriate peer review responses to an assignment.

Finally, one instructor, when asked if she believed mainstream classes were adequately addressing the writing needs of international students, responded that,

> I think it does, but not to the extent that the international classes do. It's hard, I would really like to look at the international curriculum and see what we're not doing that the international classes are doing. Having an instructor that is more grounded in that specific pedagogy and a community that they feel comfortable in is probably helpful. I think they [international students in mainstream classes] can be successful (…), but it takes an instructor who is keeping an eye on them and making sure that they understand.

Providing a comparison between curricula (mainstream and international) may help mainstream instructors understand some of the challenges that international students face with L2 writing. Since mainstream instructors do not have international students enrolled in their class every semester, providing them with this comparison when needed may be sufficient. This could be done through voluntary participation in a short seminar that is offered during the first or second week of every semester by one of the international-only section instructors.

Benefits/Challenges of instructing international students. Instructors identified what they perceived as benefits to having international students enrolled in their mainstream classes. Most instructors (88%) believed that the biggest benefit international students could provide was a different perspective on topics. For example, one instructor commented that "the greatest benefit has been opening new doors to insightful and different ways of viewing topics and issues

which leads to greater critical thinking in the class as a whole." Another instructor commented that "American students are exposed to another culture and increased diversity, which is beneficial to all." One instructor felt that having international students in his class opened up areas of professional development that he might not have otherwise had. He commented that "getting to read papers about issues, such as international students and plagiarism has been the greatest benefit."

Instructors also identified challenges in teaching international students in their mainstream classes. The largest group of instructors (75%) saw ensuring understanding on the part of the international students as the biggest challenge. This included understanding of class lectures as well as assignments. One instructor commented that "having to worry about understanding in lecture situations" was the biggest challenge. With regards to assignments, one instructor commented that "having international students understand the purpose of assignments [is a challenge]. In my limited experience, I've seen several [international students] misunderstand the assignment (in-class or major assignment) which is obviously problematic and hinders their success." Problems with understanding may stem from difficulties in listening comprehension, as research has shown that even students with high TOEFL scores may have listening comprehension problems (Mendelsohn, 2002).

These possible problems combined with international students' identified reticence in asking the instructor questions in front of their NSE counterparts could be on explanation for the observed problems in understanding lectures, in-class activities, and possibly major assignments if instructors provide oral clarification and expansion on assignment requirements. Instructors may need to consider additional ways of providing support to international students on assignments. For in-class assignments, this could include asking all students to turn to a partner

and explain the purpose or aims of the assignments in their own words. Mendelsohn (2002) found success in pairing NNSE with a NSE volunteer partner; his study found that NNSE became comfortable asking their partner for clarification which increased motivation and performance in class. Instructors could also consider something similar for students to ask questions about major assignments as well, although they would have to ensure that the NSE partner had a clear understanding of the assignment.

Perception of placement options. Instructors were asked, based on their experiences, whether they believed that mainstream classes could meet international students' writing needs or if they believed it would be better for international students to enroll in international-only sections. Most instructors (75%) indicated that they believed the decision should be made by the student.

While most instructors believed that it depended on a number of different factors as to whether international students should enroll in international-only sections, one instructor believed that at the least, international students should be in a class that had other enrolled international students:

> It's easy for them [international students] to get lost in the mainstream classes and I really think that students will do better if they are paced in an international community or at least a class where there are several international students.

The majority of instructors, however, believed that international student enrollment in a particular instructional setting depended on many different factors. Many instructors advocated for student choice. One instructor commented that the question of enrollment could "only be answered by the student." Another instructor said that she had recommended the international

section to students in the past, but believed the choice should be available for enrollment in either instructional setting:

> Mandated sections are (not) a good idea (…), but sometimes I have recommended the international sections to students because I think the instructor can better serve the student's needs. I think there should be enough sections offered so that all students who WANT that experience can have it.

This same instructor indicated that some international students who had initially enrolled in her mainstream class eventually dropped the class:

> When I have had a student who I knew was an international student [in past semesters] they ended up dropping my class. One did a late withdrawal (because he was going to enroll in the international 150 section the next semester) and one just stopped coming and got an F."

While it's unclear what prompted the second student to stop coming to the class, this instructor's comments and experiences raises the important issue of access to international-only sections for students who do want that option.

Since international-only sections are offered, it might be beneficial to find a way to ensure that there are adequate opportunities for students to enroll in those sections if they so choose. This may entail tracking how many international students want to enroll in these sections each semester and comparing that number to how many are actually able to enroll and how many are placed on wait lists, join a mainstream class, or wait for a section in a later semester to ensure that the program is offering an adequate number of sections for international students.

Level of support for instructors. One Likert-scale statement on the survey addressed whether instructors felt they received enough support in working with international-students in

their mainstream classes. Instructors indicated that they felt that they had enough support and resources (*M*=3.00; *SD*=0.76). The high standard deviation, however, suggests that some instructors felt that they could use more support or resources. This could be attributed to multiple reasons. Three instructors (37.5%) indicated that they had not had experience working with international students prior to teaching CO150 and this lack of experience may suggest that some instructors would prefer additional support. In contrast, one instructor had previously taught ESL classes before teaching CO150 classes and therefore may have felt more comfortable working with international students than those who had no experience prior to CO150.

One instructor commented that he had taken advantage of workshops that the English department had offered and believed that they were beneficial, but that more could be done. Specifically, he believed that "more could be built into the GTA orientation [since so many CO150 instructors are GTAs." He explained that, "we don't do any real experiential activities like we do with other classroom situations, like assessing students' papers. Strategies for working with NNSE could be built into [GTA] orientation."

This same instructor also believed that there should be professional development opportunities available for all interested CO150 instructors. He spoke of his own experiences in workshops offered by a TESL/TEFL faculty member and stated that these experiences had been "eye opening." He elaborated that he learned that he needed to "approach the work international students do differently from the work done by mainstream students. This is an accommodation we, as composition instructors, need to make (…) in the way that we respond to their writing." He also expressed his interest in attending additional kinds of professional development on this topic, either by this same faculty member or other faculty members from the TESL/TEFL program. He stated that "we have experts on faculty and it would be beneficial for everyone to be

able to learn from their expertise on working with international students and students whose first language is not English." This type of interest as well as the fact that some instructors had not worked with international students prior to their enrollment in their CO150 class suggests that offering workshops for CO150 instructors may be beneficial and welcomed.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

In this section, the limitations and implications of the study will be discussed. Areas of future research suggested by the study will also be discussed.

Limitations

The sample size of students from international-only sections was fairly small, representing 18 students out of approximately 120 students across five classes. The sample size of students in mainstream classes was slightly larger. Although the exact numbers of international students in mainstream classes was unknown, based on the instructors who responded that they had international students in their classes, the number of students was believed to be between 25 and 30, 14 of whom agreed to participate. Because the sample size is relatively small for both groups, conclusions drawn from the study may be limited to the students who agreed to participate. Ways of addressing this issue are discussed below.

A related limitation is that because participation in the study was voluntary, students who completed the survey or chose to participate in an interview may have done so because they were motivated by a certain factor. Whether this was a feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their experiences in CO150, or some other motivating factor is difficult to tell, but their responses may not be fully representative of the experiences of international students in CO150 as a whole.

Finally, because a small number of students completed surveys at the beginning of the semester, whereas most completed them at the end of the semester, it's possible that attitudes towards their respective enrollment option could have changed over the course of a semester. Ways of addressing this issue are discussed below.

Implications

Results from this study suggest that international students can feel comfortable and be successful in either instructional setting currently offered by the composition program at CSU. Results can provide suggestions for considerations that might make the two instructional settings even more successful at addressing the needs of international students as well as instructors.

One thing to consider is whether the number of international-only sections offered each semester is an adequate number to address the needs of those students who wish to enroll in those sections. It may be important to consider how many international students enroll in mainstream classes and subsequently drop them in order to enroll in an international-only section later. Delaying their entry into CO150 and the learning of the skills in CO150 may cause them to struggle in their other university classes if they have not yet learned to write with an expected American rhetorical style. Determining why a student enrolls and then drops a mainstream course may help provide information on how best to advise international students when they are deciding on an appropriate instructional setting.

Given the number of students, in both sections, who were unaware that they had a choice in their instructional setting, identifying ways to ensure students and their advisors are aware of these choices is important. Also, providing international student advisors with a list of talking points regarding the choice between the two sections may help ensure that international students are making an informed choice as to their options, thereby helping to ensure that they enroll in the section that will be the best fit for them.

Some international students are encouraged not to take CO150 in their first year of enrollment at CSU, especially if they might have prerequisites that they need to complete in their chosen field of study (Lisa Langstraat, personal communication, February 18, 2014). However,

given the experience of some students in this study, particularly the student who struggled with writing during her first year of enrollment and the student who believed his previous papers could have been better if he had first had CO150, it might be advisable for international students to enroll in CO150 as early in their academic career as possible, so as to mitigate some of the reported struggles and frustrations. Students may also be better able to see the application of CO150 to their current and future studies if they have not already had to learn American writing standards on their own in other university classes.

Instructors in mainstream classes may want to consider ways in which they could modify some of the activities they do in class when international students are enrolled in their classes. Instructors in mainstream classes could consider using more pair work than group work in order to minimize the opportunity for NSE to speak to each other and maximize the time that NNSE have to speak with NSE. Instructors may also consider seeing if they can identify which classmates international students feel the most comfortable with and consider pairing them together on a regular, although not exclusive, basis. This might provide another opportunity for international students to feel more comfortable during pair or group work and allow them to ask questions on assignments or lecture materials. Another consideration for instructors is finding a way to provide more time for NNSE to complete peer reviews, such as asking students to read their peer's draft the night before. Instructors in both sections may also consider providing extensive training on workshop expectations, as suggested by Hu (2005) to help ensure that students are giving and receiving appropriate feedback.

Additionally, the composition program could consider providing additional workshops or seminars on topics that will help instructors address issues or challenges of working with international students in mainstream classes. These workshops or seminars could be offered by

TESL/TEFL faculty as well as instructors of the international-only sections who have experience working with and researching L2 writers. These workshops or seminars could address the challenges students face, how (or whether) to address sentence-level errors, and ways to incorporate international students into class, group, and pair discussions.

Finally, given the interest in a mixed composition classroom (half NSE and half NNSE) by students in both instructional settings, the composition program may consider whether offering such an instructional setting is possible or if there may be interest on the part of NSE. Given the success from previous studies of mixed composition classrooms (e.g. Matsuda & Silva 1999; Ibrahim & Penfield, 2005), and the interest on the part of international students, it's an option worth considering, especially since there are composition instructors currently on staff who have experience teaching both international-only sections as well as mainstream classes.

Areas for Further Research

Based on the limited sample size for the current study, replication of the study is recommended in order to determine if the conclusions drawn from this study can be generalized outside the context of the study. Obtaining a larger sample size, especially of students in the international-only sections so that it is more representative, is recommended. In addition, analysis, such as t-tests or Mann-Whitney *U* tests, could be done in order to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the two instructional settings as was qualitatively observed in this study.

Since some students completed the survey at the beginning of a semester and others at the end, it is important to determine if attitudes toward respective sections may change over the course of a semester. Surveys could be given at the beginning and end of the same semester to the same group of students to determine if this is the case.

REFERENCES

Angelova, M. & Riazantseva, A. (1999). “If you don’t tell me, how can I know?”: A case study of four international students learning to write the U.S. way. *Written Communication, 16*(4), 491-525.

Atkinson, D. & Ramanathan, V. (1995). Cultures of writing: An ethnographic comparison of L1 and L2 university writing/language programs. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(3), 539-568.

Braine, G. (1994a). ESL students in freshman English: An evaluation of placement options. *TESL Reporter, 27*(2), 41-49.

Braine, G. (1994b). Starting ESL classes in freshman writing programs. *TESOL Journal, 3*, 22-26.

Braine, G. (1996). ESL students in first-year writing courses: ESL versus mainstream classes. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*(2), 91-107.

Burt, Rose. (2010). Assessment of ESL students in the mixed classroom environment. *LORE, 8*(1), 1-14.

Connor, U. (2002). New directions in Contrastive Rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 493-510.

Connor, U. (2004). Intercultural rhetoric research: beyond texts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,3*(4), 291-304

Coxhead, A. & Byrd, P. (2007). Preparing writing teachers to teach the vocabulary and grammar of academic prose. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 129-147.

Costino, K.A. & Hyon, S. (2007). “A class for students like me”: Reconsidering relationships among identity labels, residency status, and students’ preferences for mainstream or multilingual composition. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(2), 63-81.

Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J.W. & Clark, V.L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second language proficiency. *Language Learning, 39*(1), 81-141.

East, J. (2006). The problem of plagiarism in academic culture. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 2*(2), 16-28.

Ewert, D. (2009). L2 writing conferences: Investigating teacher talk. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*(4), 251-269.

Gibbons, P. (2006). *Bridging Discourses in the ESL Classroom: Students, teachers and researchers.* London: Continuum.

Goldstein, L.M. & Conrad, S.M. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(3), 443-460.

Harklau, L. (1994). ESL versus mainstream classes: Contrasting L2 learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(2), 241-272.

Healy, P. & Hall, B.J. (1994). From separation to integration: Accessing students' complementary resources. *College ESL, 4*(1), 20-27.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hsieh, M. (2007). Challenges for international students in higher education: One student's narrated story of invisibility and struggle. *College Student Journal, 41*(2), 379-391.

Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research, 9*(3), 321-242.

Huang, J. (2012). Using generalizability theory to examine the accuracy and validity of large-scale ESL writing assessment. *Assessing Writing, 17*(3), 123-139.

Ibrahim, N. & Penfield, S. (2005). Dynamic diversity: New dimensions in mixed composition classes. *ELT Journal, 59*(3), 217-225.

Institute of International Education (2011, November 14). International student enrollment increased by 5 percent in 2010/2011, led by strong increase in students from China [Press release]. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/Who-We-Are/News-and-Events/Press-Center/Press-Release/2011/2011-11-14-Open-Doors-International-Students.

Kaplan, R.B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning, 16*(1), 11-25.

Leki, I. (1992). Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Leki, I. & Carson, J. (1997). "Completely different worlds:" EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(1), 39-69.

Matsuda, P.K. (1999). Composition studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of labor. *College Composition and Communication, 50*(4), 699-721.

Matsuda, P.K. (2006a). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in US College Composition. *College English, 68*(6), 637-651.

Matsuda, P.K. (2006b). On the ethical treatment of ESL writers. In P.K. Matsuda, M. Cox, J. Jordan, & C. Ortmeier-Hooper (Eds), *Second-language writing in the composition classroom: A critical sourcebook* (154-158). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

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

Maxwell, A., Curtis, G.J., & Vardanega, L. (2008). Does culture influence understanding and perceived seriousness of plagiarism? *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 4*(2), 25-40.

Mendelsohn, D. (2002). The 'lecture buddy' system: An experiment in EAP listening comprehension. *TESL Canada Journal, 20*(1), 64-73.

Ouellette, M. A. (2008). Weaving strands of writing identity: Self as author and the NNES "plagiarist." *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(4), 255-273.

Özturgut, O. & Murphy, C. (2010). Literature vs. practice: challenges for international students in the U.S. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 22*(3), 374-385.

Patthey-Chavez, G. G. & Ferris, D. R. (1997). Writing conferences and the weaving of multi-voiced texts in college composition. *Writing in the Teaching of English, 31*(1), 51-90.

Ramage, J.D., Bean, J.C., & Johnson, J. (2012). *The Allyn & Bacon guide to writing: Concise edition* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Longman.

Ramanathan, V. & Atkinson, D. (2006). Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. In P.K. Matsuda, M. Cox, J. Jordon, C. Ortmeier-Hooper (Eds.), *Second-language writing in the composition classroom: A critical sourcebook* (76-88). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Reeves, J. R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research, 99*(3), 131-143.

Reid, J. (2006). “Eye” learners and “ear” learners: Identifying the language needs of international students and U.S. resident writers. In P.K. Matsuda, M. Cox, J. Jordon, C. Ortmeier-Hooper (Eds.), *Second-language writing in the composition classroom: A critical sourcebook* (76-88). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin’s.

Rinnert, C. & Kobayashi, H. (2005). Borrowing words and ideas: Insights from Japanese L1 writers. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 15*(1), 31–56.

Saberi-Najafi, N. & Chandler, S. (2012). *A shift from mainstream class to the cross-cultural option for ESL writing students*. Paper presented at the 2012 Hawaii International Conferences on Arts & Humanities, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Sadler, W.R. (2004). *A Case Study Examination of ESL Students in Freshman English Composition.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.

Shen, F. (1989). The classroom and the wider culture: Identity as a key to learning English composition. *College Composition and Communication, 40*(4), 459-466.

Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(4), 657-677.

Silva, T. (1997). Differences in ESL and native-English-speaker writing: The research and its implications. In C. Severino, J.C. Guerra, & J. E. Butler (Eds.), *Writing in multicultural settings* (209-219). New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Sowden, C. (2005). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in higher education abroad. *ELT Journal, 59*(3), 226-233.

Stuart, C. D. (2012). *Succeeding through uncertainty: Three L2 students in a first-year composition class*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

Sweedler-Brown, C.O. (1993). ESL essay evaluation: The influence of sentence-level and rhetorical features. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*(1), 3-17.

Wheeler, G. (2009). Plagiarism in the Japanese universities: Truly a cultural matter? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*(1), 17-29.

Youngs, C.S. & Youngs, G.A. (2001) Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes toward ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 97-120.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(1), 79-97.

Zamel, V. (1995). The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication, 46*(4), 506-521.

Zhu, W. (2006). Interaction and feedback in mixed peer response groups. In P.K. Matsuda, M. Cox, J. Jordon, C. Ortmeier-Hooper (Eds.), *Second-language writing in the composition classroom: A critical sourcebook* (76-88). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY FOR MAINSTREAMED INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Please complete the following information:

First Language:
How long have you been studying English? (years)
How long have you been studying at CSU (**not** including time at the AEP/INTO)? (years)
Which country are you from?
Did you take writing classes for English Language Learners **before** enrolling in this class? If yes, how many writing classes have you taken? Where did you take them?

Please answer the following questions:

1. When you enrolled in this section of CO150, were you aware that there are also CO150 classes specifically for international students—where all the students in the class are international students? (Circle one): Yes No 1a. If no, would you have enrolled in the international only section of CO150 if you had known about it? (Circle one): Yes No 1b. If yes, please explain why you decided to enroll in this section of CO150 rather than an international only section:
2. What concerns do you have as an international student in a writing class with mostly native English speakers?
3. Has your writing changed as a result of being in this class? If so, how?
4. Do you think your English has improved as a result of being in this class? Why/why not?

For each statement, please write an "x" in the box that best represents your opinion. An example has been provided for you:

Example:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I enjoy English class		X		

1. I feel comfortable working/talking with native English speaking students in the class in pairs or groups.				
2. I think I learn better when I work with native English speaking students in the class.				
3. I feel comfortable asking the instructor questions during class, in front of native English speaking students in the class.				
4. When I ask my instructor questions, he/she understands what I am asking and is able to answer my question(s).				
5. During lectures, I am able to understand what my instructor is saying.				
6. When my instructor gives directions for class work and assignments, I understand what he/she is asking us to do.				
7. If I don't understand something the instructor says, I feel comfortable asking a native English speaking student in the class for help.				
8. I think the atmosphere of my class is friendly and welcoming.				
9. During peer workshop, it is easy for me to comment on the writing of my native English speaking classmates.				
10. During peer workshop, I think that my native English speaking classmates make comments that are helpful for my revisions.				
11. I feel comfortable showing my writing to my native English speaking classmates.				
12. I feel that my instructor pays as much attention to me as to the native English speaking classmates in the class.				
13. I prefer to have an instructor who is familiar with my culture.				
14. I understand why my professor uses video clips or pictures in class to discuss a class topic or theme.				
15. I understand the class theme.				
16. I feel that my opinions and thoughts are valued in class.				
17. I feel that my writing has improved because of this class.				
18. I feel that this class is adequately preparing me for writing in other college classes.				
19. I understand the expectations in this class. That is, I understand what I need to do in order to do well in this class.				
20. I feel comfortable working with native English speaking peers in this class.				
21. I understand what constitutes plagiarism.				

22. I would prefer to be in a composition class where my other classmates are:	All non-native speakers of English	All native speakers of English	Half native speakers of English and half non-native speakers of English

APPENDIX B: SURVEY FOR INTERNATIONAL-ONLY SECTION STUDENTS

Please complete the following information:

First language:
How long have you been studying English? (years)
How long have you been studying at CSU (**not** including time at the AEP/INTO)? (years)
Which country are you from?
Did you take writing classes for English Language Learners before enrolling in this class? If yes, how many writing classes have you taken? Where did you take them?

Please answer the following questions:

1. When you enrolled in this section of CO150, were you aware that you could also enroll in a mainstream CO150 class—where most of the students in the class are native English speakers? (Circle one): Yes No 1a. If no, would you have enrolled in mainstream section of CO150 if you had known that you could? (Circle one): Yes No 1b. If yes, please explain why you decided to enroll in this section of CO150 rather than a mainstream section:
2. What concerns do you have as an international student in a writing class with other international students?
3. Has your writing changed as a result of being in this class? If so, how?
4. Do you think your English has improved as a result of being in this class? Why/why not?

For each statement, please write an "x" in the box that best represents your opinion. An example has been provided for you:

Example:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I enjoy English class		X		

1. I feel comfortable working/talking with other international students in the class.				
2. I think I learn better when I work with other international students rather than native English speaking students.				
3. I feel comfortable asking the instructor questions during class, in front of other students in the class.				
4. When I ask my instructor questions, he/she understands what I am asking and is able to answer my question(s).				
5. During lectures, I am able to understand what my instructor is saying.				
6. When my instructor gives directions for class work and assignments, I understand what he/she is asking us to do.				
7. If I don't understand something the instructor says, I feel comfortable asking other students in the class for help.				
8. I think the atmosphere of my class is friendly and welcoming.				
9. During peer workshop, it is easy for me to comment on the writing of my classmates.				
10. During peer workshop, I think that my classmates make comments that are helpful in my revisions.				
11. I feel comfortable showing my writing to my classmates.				
12. I feel that my instructor pays as much attention to me as to other classmates in the class.				
13. I prefer to have an instructor who is familiar with my culture.				
14. I understand why my professor uses video clips or pictures in class to discuss a class topic or theme.				
15. I understand the class theme.				
16. I feel that my opinions and thoughts are valued in class.				
17. I feel that my writing has improved because of this class.				
18. I feel that this class is adequately preparing me for writing in other college classes.				
19. I understand the expectations in this class. That is, I understand what I need to do in order to do well in this class.				
20. I understand what constitutes as plagiarism.				

21. I would prefer to be in a composition class where my other classmates are: (Circle One)	All non-native speakers of English	All native speakers of English	Half native speakers of English and half non-native speakers of English

APPENDIX C: SURVEY FOR MAINSTREAM INSTRUCTORS

WITH INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Please complete the following information:

How long have you been teaching college composition? (years)
How long have you been teaching CO150? (years)
How many international students do you have in your class? (If you have international students in more than one class, please list the section and the number of international students in each section.)

Please answer the following questions:

1. Have you worked with international students in composition classes before? Circle One: Yes No 1a. If yes, please briefly explain your previous experience:
2. Do you feel comfortable teaching international students in your composition classes? Why/Why not?
3. Were you aware that there are international only sections of CO150? (Circle one): Yes No
4. Were you aware that international students could enroll in mainstream classes and that you could potentially have international students in your class? (Circle one): Yes No
5. What has been the greatest benefit to having international students in your class?
6. What has been the greatest challenge in working with international students?
7. After teaching international students, do you think that international students should enroll in international only sections of CO150 or are their needs met in mainstream classes? Please explain your answer.

For each statement, please write an “x” in the box that best represents your opinion.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think that the international students feel comfortable working/talking with native English speaking students in the class in pairs or groups.				
2. I think that the international students feel comfortable asking me questions during class.				
3. When international students ask me questions, I understand what they are asking and am able to answer their questions.				
4. During lectures, I think that the international students are able to understand me as well as the native English speaker students.				
5. When I give directions for class work and assignments, I think that international students are able to understand what I’m asking them to do.				
6. If an international student doesn’t understand something I say, I think they feel comfortable asking a native English speaking student in the class for help.				
7. I think the atmosphere of my class is friendly and welcoming for international students.				
8. During peer workshop, I think it is easy for international students to comment on the writing of their native English speaking classmates.				
9. During peer workshop, I think that native English speaking classmates make comments that are helpful for international students to make revisions.				
10. I feel I have enough support/resources for working with international students.				
11. International students understand what is and what is not plagiarism.				

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR STUDENTS

1. Tell me about the kind of writing you are doing CO150. What is hard about it? What is easy?
2. What do you think your CO150 instructor is looking for in your writing? In other words, what do you have to do to do well in the class?
3. Do you find that you have enough support in your CO150 class? (In what ways do you have enough support? In what ways do you need more support?)
4. Have you used any outside resources such as the Writing Center or a writing tutor?
5. Can you think of a time when you learned something in CO150 that you then used successfully in your writing for another class? Describe that. Does writing in CO150 help you in writing that you need to do for your other classes/major? In what ways?
6. Have you ever been asked to write something in your content courses that you had never written before? How did you approach it? How did you find out what to do? (If not, how would you learn how to write it?)
7. CO150 often involves a lot of pair/group work and class participation. Do you feel comfortable with these activities? Why/why not?
8. Do you feel comfortable asking your instructor (either in or outside of class) questions if you don't understand something? Why/why not?
9. What additional support, if any, do you think you need in CO150?

APPENDIX E: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR INSTRUCTORS

1. What kind of writing have students done in CO150 this semester? What went well in teaching these assignments and what was challenging?
2. What are you looking for in a student's writing? In other words, what does a student have to do to do well in the class?
3. What specific challenges did you face in evaluating international students' writing? How did you overcome those challenges?
4. Did you encourage your international students to use outside sources, such as the Writing Center or tutor?
5. How much pair/group work do you use in your class? What challenges did international students and/or native English speaking students paired with international students face in these situations?
6. Do you think you had enough support for any questions or concerns you might have in working with international students? If no, what are some ways in which the English department or other programs/departments on campus could provide additional support?
7. Were you able to adequately understand and address questions international students may have had during the semester?
8. Based on the writing you saw from international students, do you feel you have adequately addressed their writing needs? Do you feel they are prepared to write in other academic contexts?