OJED
OPEN JOURNALS IN EDUCATION

Faculty Views on International Students: A Survey Study

Li Jin[a] and Jason Schneider[a]

Abstract: This article investigates perceptions of international students among faculty at a university in the United States. Based on data collected from a large-scale online survey (n = 261), the study explores four issues: (1) faculty perceptions of international students' positive attributes; (2) faculty perceptions of international students' academic and social challenges; (3) faculty perceptions of their own challenges when teaching international students; and (4) statistically significant relationships between faculty views and their own background characteristics, including ethnicity, academic status, multilingual skills, birth place, and experience studying or living abroad. Results offer new insights on faculty beliefs and highlight key considerations in the hiring, training, and support of faculty to promote positive learning experiences for international students.

Keywords: faculty beliefs, international students, internationalization, quantified qualitative data, survey study

Introduction

Over the last two decades, internationalization has evolved from being "an interesting and appealing component of an institution's profile" to "a core issue of concern" (Rumbley, Altback, & Reisberg, 2012, p. 3). In the case of the United States, it is difficult to imagine an institution that is not actively pursuing a strategy of "comprehensive internationalization" (Hudzik, 2011), and invariably, the recruitment of international students—that is, primarily, students on F-1 visas who have come to the US for the purpose of study—holds special status. This is due, at least in part, to the effort by colleges and universities to find new sources of revenue.

Given the arrival of more international students in recent years, many members of the campus community—including support staff, domestic students, and faculty—are increasingly concerned with how to accommodate students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The role of faculty on this issue, in particular, should not be underestimated. We know that faculty are key to the success of all students (Cole, 2010; O'Meara, Knudsen, & Jones, 2013; Yee, 2016). In the case of international students,

---

[a] DePaul University.

researchers have documented ways in which faculty behaviors can shape these students' experiences both positively and negatively (Montgomery, 2017; Yan & Pei, 2018). Glass, Kociolek, Wongtrirat, Lynch, and Cong (2015) speculated that faculty may be "the most influential persons shaping an international student's academic trajectory" (p. 353; see also Korhonen & Weil, 2015). Stohl (2007) observed that without strong faculty engagement, the larger project of internationalization "will not deliver the learning, discovery, and engagement that we seek" (p. 360). Nonetheless, as others have noted, the role of faculty in internationalization has received limited scholarly attention (Cao, Li, Jiang, & Bai, 2014; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Haan, Gallagher, & Varandani, 2017; Korhonen & Weil, 2015; Leask, 2013; Sawir, 2011).

The current paper aims to address the gap by reporting on both qualitative and quantitative results from a large-scale online survey (n = 261) conducted among faculty at a university in the United States. This paper draws on the results to investigate four interrelated issues: (1) faculty perceptions of international students' positive attributes; (2) faculty perceptions of international students' academic and social challenges; (3) self-reported faculty challenges in teaching international students; (4) statistically significant relationships between faculty background characteristics (e.g., ethnicity and multilingual skills) and their perceptions of international students. We believe the results reported here offer an important contribution to the growing discourse on internationalization by uncovering what faculty believe about international students and connecting those views to faculty members' own diverse background characteristics.

Literature Review

Empirical studies exploring the topic of faculty and international students have followed one of two approaches: gathering data through surveys or interviews with international students (Glass et al., 2015; Mak, Bodycott, & Ramburuth, 2015; Mamiseishvili, 2012; Palmer, 2016), or gathering data through surveys, interviews, or other methods with faculty (Andrade, 2010; Cao et al., 2014; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Haan et al., 2017; Korhonen & Weil, 2015; Sawir, 2011; Trice, 2003). At least one study employs a combination of both approaches (Nieto & Booth, 2010). Other publications offer theoretical or anecdotal insights with the help of secondary empirical sources (Edwards & Teekends, 2012; Leask, 2007; Lillyman & Bennett, 2014; Ramachandran, 2011; Roy, 2013; Ryan & Viete, 2009). Given that our study draws on data collected from faculty, we are primarily interested in studies that take a similar approach. However, insights from students and theoretical arguments also offer crucial knowledge, so we have also included these studies in the literature review.

A useful overarching observation comes from Haan et al. (2017), who described a "mismatch" between faculty beliefs and practices in relation to international students. On the one hand, many faculty participants in a survey carried out at their university expressed a positive view on the idea of internationalization and the arrival of more international students. They valued the "exposure to other cultures" and the "global learning environment," which offers domestic students "a wonderful chance to grow and learn from others" (p. 42). On the other hand, faculty expressed "reservations about their own roles in working with a changing student population" (p. 46) and resent adapting their

teaching practices for linguistically diverse students. This dichotomy provides a generative frame for interpreting the insights that emerge from a range of studies.

In terms of appreciating international students, the view that they add cultural, experiential, and linguistic diversity is a commonplace theme in the literature. Writing from a British perspective, Ramachandran (2011) heralded this new diversity as a site for mutual exchange: "While students in the UK get firsthand information on issues that stem from religion, politics and social life, and culture and practices in different countries, overseas students benefit from experiences in an international environment" (p. 202). Similarly, Ryan and Viete (2009) observed that the arrival of more international students in Australia has represented "an enormous potential for the learning of all" (p. 303). Drawing on data from interviews with faculty in four departments at a U.S. university, Trice (2003) identified specific contributions of international students. The two positive contributions mentioned by faculty across all four disciplines were the students' potential to provide an "international perspective within the unit" and to represent "the highest quality of students" (p. 392).

While these and other positive views emerge from the literature, studies also highlight instances of faculty uncertainty, frustration, or lack of preparation. One important area of focus has been international students' language abilities. Multiple studies confirm that faculty consider some students' linguistic skills to be weak or even inadequate for typical academic tasks (Andrade, 2010; Cao et al., 2014; Haan et al., 2017; Nguyen, 2013; Roy, 2013; Ryan & Viete, 2009; Trice, 2003). As Cao et al. (2014) note, weak language skills can also foreground other problems, including cultural isolation (see also Trice, 2003). Along the same lines, Ryan and Viete (2009) observed that faculty often see multilingual students as working with a deficit, and language skills can indirectly affect "the ways international students are assessed and afforded rights of participation" (p. 305; see also Zamel, 1995; Marginson, 2013). More pointedly, they argued that "many academics base their assessments of students on judgements about students' use and control of language and these can be influenced by idealized views of language fluency and sophistication" (p. 305). As a result, faculty usually show minimal interest in helping students with their English skills or learning more about pedagogical methods for teaching linguistically diverse students (Andrade, 2010; Haan et al., 2017).

Beyond the issue of language, existing research documents other perceived student challenges, including cultural differences (Eland & Thomas, 2013; Trice, 2003), social segregation (Cao et al., 2014; Eland & Thomas, 2013; Trice, 2003), financial difficulties (Ramachandran, 2011; Trice, 2003), student self-efficacy (Mak et al., 2013), and unfamiliarity with some U.S. pedagogic approaches (Roy, 2013; Zhao, Kuh, & Carini, 2005). These insights are unsurprising for anyone who has experience working with international students. Perhaps the more pressing question is the extent to which faculty's own background characteristics may shape these attitudes and beliefs.

Among the limited studies investigating this issue, two studies (Fallon & Brown, 1999; Nieto & Booth, 2010) reported that faculty with higher intercultural competencies (e.g., English as a second language instructors or those who speak a foreign language and have experience teaching abroad) have more positive attitudes toward international students. Another study (De Beuckelaer, Lievens, & Bücker, 2012) documented the extent to which

cross-cultural competencies among faculty (e.g., high levels of cultural empathy and open-mindedness) are appreciated by students in multicultural and international settings. Two other studies (Biglan, 1973; Trice, 2003) showed that faculty disciplines influence their perceptions of international students and international education. Specifically, faculty in hard sciences and engineering are less sensitive to the unique challenges faced by international students and more prone to frame their challenges as deficits.

The studies cited above provide basis for insights on faculty and internationalization. However, the overall number of studies remains small, and there are very few studies that incorporate quantitative methodology in analyzing faculty perceptions (exceptions include Cao et al., 2014; Nieto & Booth, 2010; Sawir, 2011). The current study was conducted to further investigate faculty perceptions of international students by quantifying those perceptions and examining their relationships to faculty background characteristics.

Research Questions

A total of four research questions were answered in the current study.

1. What are faculty perceptions of positive attributes brought by international students?
2. What are faculty perceptions of challenges faced by international students?
3. What are faculty perceptions of challenges they face when teaching international students?
4. Are there statistically significant relationships between faculty perceptions of international students and their background characteristics, including academic discipline, ethnicity, academic status, multilingual skills, and experience studying or living abroad?

Methodology

This study involved qualitative data analysis followed by descriptive statistical analysis of quantified qualitative data (e.g., Sandelowski, Voils, & Knafl, 2009). Two major phases of data analysis were undertaken. Phase 1 focused on qualitative analysis, i.e., identifying patterns and themes in answers to three open-ended questions, the results of which help answer Research Questions 1, 2, and 3. Phase 2 was comprised of quantifying the results in Phase 1, including tabulating the frequencies of themes identified in Phase 1, followed by a series of chi-square analyses of independence. The results of the chi-square analyses were aimed specifically at answering Research Question 4. The driving force for the adoption of this two-phase design is the triple purpose of the study, which aims to (1) identify faculty perceptions, some of which we believe are most effectively gathered through open-ended qualitative responses; (2) to quantify and rank those perceptions according to frequency; and (3) to understand the relationships between those perceptions and faculty backgrounds. As mentioned earlier, data were collected through a single source, an online survey. To address the specific research questions stated above, only pertinent data from the survey were analyzed.

Data Collection

The study was conducted at a comprehensive private university in the Midwestern region of the United States. The entire faculty at the university, including both full-time and part-time instructors, were invited to be research participants. Based on the literature review and researchers' interests, an online survey containing 17 questions was developed (Appendix A). The first seven questions were multiple choice, asking about respondents' background information. The last 10 questions were either multiple choice or open ended, asking about faculty perceptions, beliefs, and practices. A pilot study was conducted with a group of faculty volunteers, which led to some revisions. After approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board for the revised instrument, a recruitment email was officially distributed in April 2017 to the entire faculty. Faculty were apprised of the purpose of the study and informed that they would not be financially compensated for filling out the survey. Three email reminders were sent over the span of 4 weeks. Among 1,865 faculty members from 10 colleges at the institution, 261 sets of responses were collected, which renders a response rate of 14.0%. The survey completion rate was 99%, which means only a very small number of respondents did not complete the survey after opening it. Only the data collected from Questions 1–11 were analyzed for the current study.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted in two major phases. Phase 1 aimed to identify emerging themes in open-ended questions in relation to three issues: (1) positive attributes of international students (Survey Question 9); (2) challenges faced by international students (Survey Question 10); (3) challenges faced by faculty (Survey Question 11). To ensure a comprehensive understanding of various faculty perceptions, a grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) was adopted. First, both researchers independently identified, grouped, and coded data that shared similar themes. Then, they met and compared results. Discrepancies were discussed until an agreement was reached for a series of definitive codes. At the end of Phase 1, emerging categories were identified to help answer Research Questions 1, 2, and 3.

For Phase 2, three major steps were undertaken for descriptive statistical analysis. Step 1 focused on tabulating in an Excel file each category in all three areas identified in Phase 1. Those participants whose comments contained codes under a certain category were given a value of 1 and those whose comments did not were given 0. Categories for which the frequencies were lower than 20 (7.7% of the total survey respondents) would not render meaningful statistical analysis and thus were excluded from further quantitative analysis. In Step 2, the data regarding participants' college, academic status, ethnicity, place of birth, prior experience studying or living abroad, and multilingual skills were tabulated and recorded in the same Excel file. Step 3 comprised a series of chi-square analyses of independence, which evaluated statistically significant relationships between faculty's perceptions identified in Step 1 and their respective background characteristics identified in Step 2. All chi-square analyses were run through SPSS version 24 (IBM Corp, 2016). In order to meet all assumptions of chi-square tests, especially the assumption that the

expected values in all frequency cells exceed five counts, the researchers retabulated the data related to three faculty background characteristics (faculty's college, ethnicity, and academic status) by combining certain categories and ran additional chi-square tests. The results of Phase 2 help address Research Question 4.

Findings

Before presenting findings, it is important to note some features of survey participants' backgrounds, and particularly those that were found to have statistically significant influence on responses. As shown in Table 1, the majority of participants self-identified as White (77.78%), were born in the United States (77.78%), and speak only English (56.7%). There was a diverse range of faculty ranks represented, with nearly half of responses (46.36%) coming from part-time faculty. These demographics generally reflect the overall faculty demographics at the university, as white faculty account for 71.2% of the entire faculty and part-time faculty account for 50.1%.

Faculty Perceptions of International Students' Positive Attributes

Survey participants' responses to the open-ended question about positive attributes brought by international students (question 9) were grouped into the following four categories, as illustrated in Table 2: international students offer different and diverse views; they have better academic performances; they bring global perspectives to class discussions and assignments; and they contribute to campus multilingualism. Regarding the different and diverse cultural perspectives brought by international students, one participant stressed that international students bring "a diverse perspective to language and culture. A different approach to education and accessing/sharing knowledge. A [generally] different way of seeing the world and interpreting things."

Faculty Perceptions of Challenges Faced by International Students

In terms of challenges faced by international students (Question 10), analysis of results found that faculty believe international students face three primary types of challenges on and off campus (Table 3). These have been categorized as academic challenges, sociocultural challenges, and other challenges related to finances, legal status, and professional aspirations. Regarding academic challenges, a total of 173 participants (66.28%) pointed out that students encounter great challenges due to their lack of English language proficiency. While many of these responses addressed language challenges in general, some highlighted the following specific skills: writing (20.68%), oral communication (16.09%), reading (4.59%), and listening (2.68%). The second most frequently mentioned academic challenge lies in the differing academic expectations or preparation that international students may have upon arriving to a U.S. campus. Sixty-nine faculty participants (26.44%) pointed out that international students usually have different understandings about various aspects of the academic environment, including the professor–student relationship, teaching/learning styles, in-class participation, assignment requirements, and academic integrity. Some academic challenges—such as students' lack of confidence in speaking English, lack of knowledge

Table 1. Faculty backgrounds.

	Number of faculty	Percentage (n = 261)
Ethnicity		
White	203	77.78
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.38
Asian	13	4.98
Black or African American	12	4.60
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0.00
Hispanic	6	2.30
Mixed race	5	1.92
Other	7	2.68
Academic status		
Tenured full professor	26	9.96
Tenured associate professor	49	18.77
Untenured assistant professor	25	9.58
Full-time non-tenure-track professor	33	12.64
Adjunct professor/Part-time professor	121	46.36
Birth place		
Born in the US	203	77.78
Born outside the US	45	17.62
If born in the US, experience abroad?		
Yes	127	62.56
No	88	43.35
Multilingual skills		
Only English	148	56.70
One foreign language	64	24.52
More than one foreign language	43	16.48

Note: There are missing data in each category. Thus, the percentage is calculated based on the total number of collected surveys except for the category regarding faculty's prior experience abroad, which is based on the total number of faculty born in the US.

about students' rights and other campus resources, a narrow worldview, and lack of rigor—were mentioned by only a few participants.

Regarding sociocultural challenges, faculty responses were organized into the following five categories: international students' lack of local social networks, cultural differences, lack of daily communication skills, discrimination and social exclusion in the US, and self-seclusion. Concern about international students' loneliness in the US due to their loss of familial support and difficulty in building new networks in the US was the most frequently noted sociocultural challenge (21.07%). The second most mentioned (18.39%) was that of cultural differences between international students' home cultures and the US.

Table 2. Faculty perceptions of international students' positive attributes.

Faculty perceptions	Number of faculty	Percentage (n = 261)
International students bring different and diverse views to the campus.	200	76.63
International students usually have better academic performances.	75	28.74
International students bring global perspectives.	28	10.73
International students enhance multilingualism on campus.	21	8.05

Note. There are missing data in this question. The percentage was calculated based on the total number of survey respondents.

Table 3. Faculty perceptions of challenges faced by international students.

Faculty perceptions	Number of faculty	Percentage (n=261)
Academic challenges		
Limited English language proficiency	173	66.28
Different academic preparation or expectations	69	26.44
Lack of confidence in speaking English	16	6.13
Lack of knowledge of student rights and resources on campus	9	3.45
Narrow world view	5	1.92
Lack of rigor	1	0.38
Sociocultural challenges		
Loneliness due to lack of local social network	55	21.07
Cultural differences	48	18.39
Lack of daily-life communication skills	38	14.56
Discrimination and social exclusion encountered in the U.S.	37	14.18
Self-seclusion	5	1.91
Other challenges: financial, legal, professional challenges	12	4.60

Faculty Perceptions of Challenges Faced by Faculty

Although open-ended Survey Question 11 asked participants to identify the challenges they face when teaching international students, most participants reported instead on challenges faced by international students. As shown in Table 4, only 37 participants (14.18%) explicitly pointed to challenges that they face in teaching international students, such as uncertainty when explaining and grading assignments, understanding

international students' accented English or written homework, and engaging them in class activities. One participant stated:

> Another issue that I have struggled with is adequately grading students that are struggling with the English language... If they are singular presentations, they struggle to make eloquent or sufficient remarks. Per writing, students who might be better at speaking sometimes struggle with sentence structure or spelling. I often don't know how to adequately and appropriately grade them in comparison to other native-English speaking students.

As noted, many responses to this question actually addressed perceived student challenges, not faculty challenges. These responses reaffirmed the views highlighted in the previous section, with the largest numbers of responses addressing students' limited English language proficiency, lack of understanding of U.S. academic culture, and limited knowledge of U.S. society in general. One participant highlighted her feeling that variations in gender norms across cultures can be a serious challenge:

> As a female professor, [I was] dealing with a male international student where it became evident that his culture or upbringing put women into more of a subservient role. I got a lot of "why will you not do this for me?" attitude I haven't seen before.

A small number of faculty participants (8.81%) also empathized with international students on life-related challenges (e.g., financial, legal, and professional challenges in the United States). Additionally, a few participants (2.68%) shifted the source of challenges to the university, citing a lack of personnel support and resources for helping international students. Also, interestingly, 56 faculty (21.46%) reported "none" in response to question 11.

Table 4. Faculty perceptions of challenges faced by faculty.

Faculty perceptions	Number of faculty	Percentage (n=261)
Faculty challenges	37	14.18
Student challenges		
International students' limited English language proficiency	119	45.59
International students' lack of understanding of U.S. academic culture	65	24.90
International students' limited knowledge about U.S. society in general	31	11.88
Other challenges faced by international students	23	8.81
Lack of university support	7	2.68
None	56	21.46

Relationships Between Faculty Perceptions and Background Characteristics

Over 100 chi-square tests of independence were conducted to examine relationships between the identified faculty perceptions and their various background characteristics. Nine pairs of relationships are statistically significant, as shown in Table 5 (data about statistically insignificant relationships are available upon request). Further examination of frequency distribution shows that White faculty (85.5%), compared to non-White faculty (72.7%), are more likely to see international students' diverse views as a positive attribute. Similarly, faculty who were born in the US but have studied or lived abroad (88.53%) are more likely than those who have not (78.31%) to have this view. White faculty (74.7%) are also more likely than non-White faculty (59.1%) to explain international students' academic challenges in terms of limited English language proficiency. Faculty who were born in the US (76.41%) are more likely than those who were born outside the US (53.49%) to point to English language challenges. Faculty who speak only English (77.54%) are more likely than those who speak one (68.25%) or more (57.50%) additional languages to say the same. Faculty who were born outside the US (41.86%) are more likely than those who were born in the US (25.64%) to believe that international students face academic challenges due to different academic preparation or expectations.

Compared to part-time faculty (20%), full-time faculty (33.9%), including tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, are more likely to frame their own challenges in terms of international students' limited knowledge about U.S. academic culture. In contrast, part-time faculty (21.8%) are more likely than full-time faculty (10.5%) to state that they face challenges when teaching international students. Lastly, non-White faculty (36.6%) are more likely than White faculty (21.1%) to report "none" when asked about challenges they face when teaching international students.

Overall, except for college, all faculty background characteristics addressed in the survey have statistically significant influence on faculty perceptions of international students.

Discussion

The results presented above cover a wide range of issues connected to faculty perceptions and attitudes. Three major issues will be the focus of the discussion here, as they highlight ways in which this study interacts with previous studies and offers new insights. Additionally, limitations of the study will be addressed.

First, a key finding is that a large percentage of faculty express a positive orientation towards international students. This affirms a point made by many other researchers (e.g., Haan et al., 2017; Ramachandran, 2011; Ryan & Viete, 2009; Trice, 2003). In particular, respondents highlighted the diverse and global perspectives that international students bring to the classroom and campus, as well as their strong academic abilities and unique multilingual skills. Additionally, faculty expressed acute awareness of and sympathy for the everyday sociocultural challenges that students encounter when studying in a new country. These points provide important reassurance that most faculty—at least at this institution—want to work with international students. This insight can be helpful

Table 5. Significant relationships between faculty perceptions and backgrounds.

	Ethnicity	Academic status	Birth place	Prior experience	Multilingual skills
Perception of different views	$\chi^2(1, n = 237) = 4.162, p = .041$			$\chi^2(1, n = 205) = 3.910, p = .048$	
Perceptions of students' academic challenges due to limited English	$\chi^2(1, n = 238) = 4.344, p = .037$		$\chi^2(1, n = 238) = 9.237, p = .002$		$\chi^2(2, n = 241) = 6.671, p = .036$
Perception of students' academic challenges due to different academic preparation or expectations			$\chi^2(1, n = 238) = 4.541, p = .033$		
Tendency to frame faculty challenges as students' limited knowledge about U.S. academic culture		$\chi^2(1, n = 234) = 5.644, p = .018$			
Perceptions of faculty challenges due to faculty difficulties		$\chi^2(1, n = 234) = 5.625, p = .018$			
Perceptions of no challenges to faculty	$\chi^2(1, n = 231) = 4.485, p = .034$				

to administrators who are trying to globalize the curriculum and the university more generally: The aim should be channeling the existing positive views of faculty towards concrete initiatives.

However, the positive perceptions of international students are sometimes coupled with an uncertainty about how to accommodate and support these students in the classroom, which Haan et al. (2017) have described as a "mismatch" in faculty attitudes. Thus, a second major point that emerges from the study is the extent to which many faculty framed their own teaching challenges in terms of student challenges, or even student limitations. When asked explicitly to identify teaching challenges, only 14.18% of respondents indicated issues that seemed to correspond to the question (e.g., challenges in understanding and assessing students); many more faculty (62.83%) framed their feelings of challenge as emanating from student characteristics, such as English language skills and cultural differences. This reveals a key tension. Faculty welcome the presence of international students, but they also feel that some of these students' specific characteristics can cause problems for teaching—a view that was especially common among full-time faculty and less common for part-time faculty. Also implicit in this view is the belief that faculty themselves do not have limitations. This corroborates research findings at other universities (e.g., Andrade, 2010; Haan et al., 2017; Ryan & Viete, 2009). Echoing the linguistically responsive instruction proposed by Haan et al. (2017), professional development should help faculty realize that the arrival of more international students does indeed require a reconsideration of pedagogic practices.

Third, a key issue that emerges from the findings, and a unique contribution to the existing literature, is the influence of faculty backgrounds on their beliefs about international students. Unlike some other studies, in particular Trice (2003) and Nieto and Booth (2010), our study did not find statistically significantly relationships between faculty views and their colleges/disciplines, which may be due at least in part to the exact disciplines offered at this specific university (e.g., there is no college of engineering). However, as described, there were multiple statistically significant relationships between faculty background characteristics and views on international students. Importantly, some of the trends are not easy to categorize in simple binary terms. For example, while White faculty are more likely than non-White faculty to comment that international students bring different views as a positive attribute, suggesting strong appreciation for cultural difference, they are also more likely to pinpoint English language skills as a key area of challenge, suggesting less tolerance for linguistic variation. On the other hand, certain relationships seem unsurprising, e.g., English monolingual faculty and those who were born in the US are more likely to see developing English language skills as a problem, and faculty who have themselves studied abroad are more likely to express appreciation for the diverse cultural contributions of international students. The documentation of relationships such as these provides empirical basis for the argument that faculty whose backgrounds are most similar to those of international students have the best chances of understanding and empathizing with them. This can be a crucial consideration in the recruitment and hiring of new faculty. The significant relationship between faculty status and their tendency to frame faculty challenges as student deficits also reveals a gap

in beliefs between full-time and adjunct faculty. Professional development can help all faculty understand their own various biases when teaching international students.

Limitations exist in this study. First, despite the high number of responses in comparison to similar studies, the response rate (14.0%) was relatively low. This might have hampered the representativeness of the data, but it is an inherent limitation of survey studies. Second, faculty perceptions of undergraduate-level and graduate-level international students may be very different, and the survey did not ask respondents to distinguish between the two.

Conclusion

The prospect that any institution can successfully welcome and support international students is largely dependent on faculty. Yet, the question of how faculty perceive and respond to international students in their own classrooms has received little research attention. Furthermore, given the extent to which the recruitment of international students today represents an effort to increase revenues, especially in the United States, fostering appropriate beliefs and effective faculty practices towards international students should be seen as an ethical obligation. The insights that emerge from this study can inform institutional decisions around faculty hiring, training, and support. However, as noted, the study has its limitations; thus, we believe similar studies need to be carried out at other institutions and in other regions of the world. This can lead to broader insights about faculty and help guide innovations that will improve the experiences of both faculty and international students in the years ahead.

Acknowledgements

References

Andrade, M. (2010). Increasing accountability. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *14*(3), 221–239.

Beuckelaer, A. D., F., L., & Bücker, J. (2012). The role of faculty members' cross-cultural competencies in their perceived teaching quality: Evidence from culturally-diverse classes in four European countries. *Journal of Higher Education*, *83*(2), 217–258.

Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *57*, 195–203.

Cao, Y., Li, X., Jiang, A., & Bai, K. (2014). Motivators and outcomes of faculty actions towards international students: Under the influence of internationalization. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *3*(4), 49–63.

Cole, D. (2010). The effects of student-faculty interactions on minority students' college grades: Differences between aggregated and disaggregated data. *Journal of the Professoriate*, *3*(2), 137–160.

Corp, I. B. M. (2016). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 24.0.* Corp, I.B.M., Armonk, NY.

Dewey, P. & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education*, *58*, 491–504.

Edwards, J. & Teekends, H. (2012). Leveraging technology and the international classroom for cross-cultural learning. In Deardorff, D. K., Wit, H., Heyl, J. D., & Adams, T., editors, *The SAGE handbook of international higher education*, pages 267–282, Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.

Eland, A. & Thomas, K. (2013). Succeeding abroad: International students in the United States. In Alberts, H. C. & Hazen, H. D., editors, *International students and scholars in the United States: Coming from abroad*, pages 145–162, New York. Palgrave Macmillan.

Fallon, G. & Brown, R. B. (1999). What about the workers? Academic staff opinion about working with non-UK postgraduate students in higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *23*, 41–52.

Glass, C. R., Kociolek, E., Wongtrirat, R., Lynch, R. J., & Cong, S. (2015). Uneven experiences: The impact of student-faculty interactions on international students' sense of belonging. *Journal of International Students*, *5*(4), 353–367.

Haan, J. E., Gallagher, C. E., & Varandani, L. (2017). Working with linguistically diverse classes across the disciplines: Faculty beliefs. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *17*(1), 37–51.

Hudzik, J. K. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action.*

Korhonen, V. & Weil, M. (2015). The internationalisation of higher education: Perspectives on self-conceptions in teaching. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *14*(3), 198–212.

Leask, B. (2007). International teachers and international learning. In Jones, E. & Brown, S., editors, *Internationalizing higher education: Enhancing teaching, learning and curriculum*, pages 86–94, New York. Routledge.

Leask, B. (2013). Internationalizing the curriculum in the disciplines—Imagining new possibilities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *17*(2), 103–118.

Lillyman, S. & Bennett, C. (2014). Providing a positive learning experience for international students studying at UK universities: A literature review. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *13*(1), 63–75.

Mak, A. S., Bodycott, P., & Ramburuth, P. (2015). Beyond host language proficiency: Coping resources predicting international students' satisfaction. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *19*(5), 460–475.

Mamiseishvili, K. (2012). International student persistence in U.S. postsecondary institutions. Higher Education. *The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, *64*(1), 1–17.

Marginson, S. (2013). Equals or others? Mobile students in a nationally bordered world. In Sovic, S. & Blythman, M., editors, *International students negotiating higher education: Critical perspectives*, pages 9–27, New York. Routledge.

Montgomery, K. A. (2017). Supporting Chinese undergraduate students in transition at U.S. colleges and universities. *Journal of International Students*, *7*(4), 963–989.

Nguyen, H. M. (2013). Faculty advisors' experiences with international graduate students. *Journal of International Students*, *3*(2), 102–116.

Nieto, C. & Booth, M. Z. (2010). Cultural competence: Its influence on the teaching and learning of international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *14*(4), 406–425.

O'Meara, K. A., Knudsen, K., & Jones, J. (2013). The role of emotional competencies in faculty-doctoral student relationships. *Review of Higher Education*, *36*(3), 315–347.

Palmer, Y. M. (2016). Student to scholar: Learning experiences of international students. *Journal of International Students*, *6*(1), 216–240.

Ramachandran, N. T. (2011). Enhancing international students' experiences: An imperative agenda for universities in the UK. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *10*(2), 201–220.

Roy, S. R. (2013). Educating Chinese, Japanese, and Korean international students: Recommendations to American professors. *Journal of International Students*, *3*(1), 10–16.

Rumbley, L., Altback, P., & Reisberg, L. (2012). Internationalization within the higher education context. In Deardorff, D. K., Wit, H., Heyl, J. D., & Adams, T., editors, *The SAGE handbook of international higher education*, pages 3–26, Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.

Ryan, J. & Viete, R. (2009). Respectful interactions: Learning with international students in the English-speaking academy. Teaching in Higher. *Education*, *14*(3), 303–314.

Sandelowski, M., Voils, C., & Knafl, G. (2009). On quantitizing. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *3*(3), 208–222.

Sawir, E. (2011). Academic staff response to international students and internationalising the curriculum: The impact of disciplinary differences. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *16*(1), 45–57.

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3), 359–372.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and technique.* Sage, London.

Trice, A. (2003). Faculty perceptions of graduate international students: The benefits and challenges. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *7*(4), 379–403.

Yan, L. & Pei, S. (2018). "Home away from home"? How international students handle difficult and negative experiences in American higher education. *Journal of International Students*, *8*(1), 453–472.

Yee, A. (2016). The unwritten rules of engagement: Social class differences in undergraduates' academic strategies. *Journal of Higher Education*, *87*(6), 831–858.

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

Zhao, C. M., Kuh, G. D., & Carini, R. M. (2005). A comparison of international student and American student engagement in effective educational practices. *Journal of Higher Education*, *76*(2), 209–231.

Author biography

Li Jin is an Associate Professor in the Department of Modern Languages at DePaul University. She also directs the Chinese Studies Program, an interdisciplinary undergraduate program. Her primary research interests include second language acquisition, study abroad and language socialization, and intercultural communication and collaboration.

Jason Schneider is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, & Discourse at DePaul University, where he also coordinates the Graduate Certificate in TESOL program. His research and teaching focus on second language writing, ESL teacher education, and the rhetorics of immigration.