Challenges and Strategies Facing International Students and Faculty in U.S. Higher Education: A Comprehensive Literature Review

Ji Ma 马 骥
Georgia State University

Abstract

With increasing numbers of international students on university campuses in the U.S., culturally and linguistically responsive (CLR) practices become more important than ever in helping students fit in a new environment and achieve their academic goals. However, not all universities and faculty are prepared or equipped with the knowledge to adopt CLR methods in classrooms across the disciplines. The purpose of this literature review is three-fold: (1) to examine the cultural and linguistic challenges that international students face in U.S. higher institutions; (2) to investigate faculty's perspectives on international students and implementing CLR practices in their classroom teaching; and (3) to explore CLR strategies or recommendations that have been used successfully to alleviate the challenges. In assessing the current status of CLR in tertiary education, this article reviewed 21 research studies and found that both international students and faculty at U.S. institutions of higher education are facing challenges in terms of language, culture, classroom discussions, academic expectations, and interpersonal relationships. These findings hold implications for promoting the development of CLR practices among faculty and tertiary institutions to foster a diverse campus capable of truly accommodating and supporting students from multicultural backgrounds.

Keywords

international students, culturally and linguistically responsive practices, challenges, faculty

Introduction

In the past decades, the number of international students in the U.S. has continued to increase, especially in higher education institutions. According to the *Open Doors 2019 Fast Facts* released by the Institute of International Education (2019), during the 2018/19 school year, the number of international students reached 1,095,299, representing 5.5% of the total number of students in the U.S. higher education. At each of the top 20 higher education institutions in the U.S., the percentage of enrolled international students ranges from 10% to over 40% of the whole student population (Martirosyan et al., 2019). This large number of international students has brought benefits to the U.S. in different aspects, such as increasing diversity and intercultural perspectives in the classroom, bringing knowledge in many fields, contributing capital to the U.S. economy, and promoting cultural exchange between countries (Lee & Rice, 2007). Referring to the latest report from the Association of International Educators, international students studying at U.S. colleges and universities contributed $28.4 billion and supported 306,308 jobs in the U.S. in 2020–2021 (NAFSA, 2021). In addition to their roles as economic contributors, Kaya (2020) also pointed out that international students are diplomatic and peace leaders globally.

Ji Ma 马 骥, Doctoral Student, Department of Middle and Secondary Education, College of Education and Human Development, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA; email jma16@student.gsu.edu.

However, this group of students faces unique challenges and pressures, including language barriers, academic challenges, social isolation, and cultural adjustments (Contreras-Aguirre & Gonzalez, 2017; Kibelloh & Bao, 2014; Wu et al., 2015). Among these, international students' limited English language proficiency in college-level coursework became the primary obstacle for them to achieve academic success as well as for professors to explain course tasks and concepts (Wu et al., 2015). For international students whose primary language is one other than English, it may take five to seven years to achieve the level of cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP), which requires a complete understanding of the cultural and linguistic knowledge in the target language (Bilash, 2011). International students who plan to complete their programs or degrees in the U.S., whether at the undergraduate or graduate level, need support in discipline-specific language learning, academic performance, and social connections to overcome language and sociocultural barriers. According to Arthur (2017) and Crose (2011), professors and classmates are vital resources for international students to learn the content knowledge and culture in the target language, especially for newcomers. Another resource lies in the peers that share the same language or culture; however, this kind of support may not prove reliable or consistent (McMahon, 2018).

Even though international students expect high levels of language and academic support from faculty, faculty often have a belief that language support for international students is not part of their responsibilities. Thus, faculty prefer international students to seek assistance outside of their classes in the form of language instructors, writing centers, and staff in the international office (Gallagher & Haan, 2018). In other words, faculty believe that language teaching should not be covered in their classes; a belief that contrasts with our understanding of the interconnectedness of language and content knowledge (Cummins, 1981). Indeed, Haan et al. (2017) found that there was a gap between "international students' needs and the faculty's knowledge of this group of students" (p. 38). Further exacerbating the situation is that faculty and even language instructors have limited training and knowledge of teaching multilingual students (Schneider, 2018). Therefore, there is a need to help faculty and staff understand the challenges international students face and provide the skills they need to meet students' linguistic and cultural expectations in courses.

One promising practice that has developed over the past 50 years is culturally responsive teaching (CRT) which aims to support students with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds (Gay, 2000; Hollins, 2008; Irvine, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Lucas & Villegas, 2013). It is "a pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural and historical references to convey knowledge, to impart skills, and to change attitudes" (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 13). Based on CRT, Hollie (2017) developed culturally and linguistically responsive (CLR) teaching and learning practices and describes them as "the validation and affirmation of the home (indigenous) culture and home language for building and bridging the student to access in the culture of academia and mainstream society" (p. 23). Hollie (2017) stated that CLR is opposite to the "sink-or-swim approach" (p. 23) that lets the students survive or fail themselves; CLR emphasizes the support and appropriate instructions students received from teachers until they became independent in learning. Researchers believe that CLR benefits all students, especially those from different races, cultures, and languages (Haan et al., 2017; Hollie, 2017). Similarly, describing linguistically responsive instruction (LRI), Gallagher and Hann (2018) cited an LRI framework that explains the knowledge and skills to support emergent multilingual students,

(a) understanding ELLs [English language learners] from a bilingual and bicultural perspective; (b) understanding how language and culture shape school experiences and inform pedagogy for bilingual learners; and (c) ability to mediate a range of contextual factors in the schools and classrooms where they teach. (de Jong et al., 2013, p. 306)

However, there is a dearth of literature on CLR practices. One reason for the lack of work in this area may stem from the perceptions that the academic outcomes of CRT/CLR/LRI practices are hard to measure, or that these practices are at once comprehensive and too abstract for application in classroom teaching (Hollie, 2017). Also, most of the existing literature focuses on students in K–12 settings in the U.S. While scholars have stressed the importance of learner-centered education and culturally relevant teaching in K–12 settings, one finds minimal attention to CLR practices at the tertiary level (Han et al., 2014). While we understand pre-service and in-service teachers' needs to understand diverse students' needs and integrate CLR teaching strategies, we do not have that same expectation for college professors. How do we equip professors in different disciplines with the knowledge to effectively teach their international students? When monolingualism is the norm in the U.S. education system, how do we prepare faculty and reexamine the higher education level curriculum when we enroll an increasing number of international students? Research in this area is vital because a large number of international students struggle with adjusting to new academic and cultural standards (Haan et al., 2017). Therefore, the purpose of the literature review is to explore challenges faced by international students, examine how CLR might improve their experiences, and make recommendations for institutions and faculty who want to help them. Ultimately, the literature review will focus on the following questions:

1. What challenges do new international students face in higher education in the U.S.?
2. What are faculty's perspectives towards international students and their academic performance?
3. How do faculty understand and apply CLR practices in their classroom teaching?
4. What CRT/CLR/LRI practices are recommended to mediate challenges for international students in U.S. tertiary institutions?

Methodology of Literature Review
This literature review aims to examine the research findings in published, empirical and conceptual research on culturally and linguistically responsive teaching in higher education, focusing specifically on international students who have just started their university lives in the U.S. Therefore, the review is limited to peer-reviewed articles that focused on faculty members and international students in academia between 2010 and 2020 since this is the period when the U.S. higher education institutions enrolled the largest number of international students in history (Israel & Batalova, 2021). First, empirical studies employing quantitative and qualitative methods and conceptual research from international sources, such as *Google Scholar*, *ERIC*, *EBSCOhost*, *Jstor*, *Psyc Infor*, *Sage*, and *Wiley Online Library* were identified. Manuals, guidelines, and books published on the Institute of International Education (2019) website, an organization supporting international education and collaboration across higher education institutions, were also included. The key terms included *faculty*, *new international students*, *culture and linguistic or language*, *challenges or barriers or difficulties*, *linguistically responsive teaching*, *culturally responsive teaching*, *higher education*, and some synonymous terms, such as *professors*, *internationalization*,

college, *university*, and *academia*. One primary aim of the review is to provide practical instructions for faculty in different disciplines to help international students achieve their academic goals and accommodate an intercultural learning environment. Therefore, conceptual articles and commentaries that are related to language support programs and learner-centered pedagogical practices were examined. The last step was to examine the articles' references to locate additional relevant articles that could be included in the literature review. Finally, one book and 37 articles, 16 of which focused on K–12 and teacher education were identified. I excluded these 16, leaving a sample of 21 articles dealing with a tertiary educational context. After the initial review, I wrote an annotated bibliography entry for each article and marked the themes that emerged from the article and connected them to the research questions. The table in the appendix shows the basic information of each article and the frequency of emerged themes that include benefits of hosting international students, challenges that international students face, faculty's opinions and knowledge on international students and CRT/CLR/LRI practices, and suggested CRT/CLR/LRI practices.

Theoretical Frameworks and Models
The literature review is grounded on the epistemology of constructivism, which "maintains that individuals create or construct their own new understandings or knowledge through the interaction of what they already believe and the ideas, events, and activities with which they come into contact" (Ültanır, 2012, p. 195). According to Ladson-Billings (2003), it is crucial to reinforce this epistemological concept because it reveals a system of knowing the world. It helps us understand that how one views the world is influenced by what knowledge one possesses, and what knowledge one is capable of possessing is influenced deeply by one's worldview. The conditions under which people live and learn shape both their knowledge and their world views. The process of developing a worldview that differs from the dominant world view requires active intellectual work on the part of the knower, because schools, society, and the structure and production of knowledge are designed to create individuals who internalize the dominant worldview and knowledge production and acquisition processes (Ladson-Billings, 2000, p. 258).

Before attempting to support international students' learning and academic success, it is necessary to understand their "ways of knowing" (Kasun, 2015, p. 277) which is shaped by their cultural and educational experiences. Under the constructivist epistemology, the overarching theoretical perspectives that inform this literature review are sociocultural theory and critical inquiry. First, sociocultural theory was developed by Vygotsky (1978), who posited that social interactions, language, and culture play an important role in learning and understanding the world. Influenced by Vygotsky, Bruner (1966, 1971, 1996) emphasized the impact of teachers' instruction, schooling and curricula, cultural awareness, and interactions on students' cognitive development. Since instruction must be structured and designed with concerns of the learners' experiences and their willingness to learn (Bruner, 1966), it is necessary to examine the faculty's thoughts in accommodating an increasing number of international students. Thus, the second focus of the literature review is to investigate faculty's awareness when they host international students whose cultures, values, languages, and studying habits are different from the dominant ones.

Critical inquiry is another lens to examine learning in social, cultural, and historical contexts. Lewis et al. (2012) stated that sociocultural theory "has allows us to explore the intersection of social, cultural, historical, mental, physical, and, more recently, political aspects of people's sense-making, interaction, and learning around texts" (p. 2). However, it did not address the impact of "power, identity, and agency" (p. 2) on learning and practice. Power exists in our

social micro and macro systems, and it plays a vital role in opportunities to learn and impacts people's lives in unpredictable ways (Moje & Lewis, 2012), especially for those who are in marginalized and neglected positions. For international students who live in a country other than their own, they have no power against policies, routines, regulations, rules when the dominate culture reproduces, enacts, and normalizes the social and learning system that subordinate the cultures of others. According to Potts and Brown (2005), from a critical perspective, "research must be about empowering the marginalized and promoting action against inequities" (p. 208). In sum, the literature review examines the CLR practices in higher education through sociocultural and critical lenses and includes perspectives from international students, faculty, staff, and school administrators or leaders. The following section discusses what the literature says about international students' challenges and how faculty could help with alleviating the challenges by integrating CRT/CLR/LRI practices.

Synthesis of Literature

International Students' Challenges
In addition to the barriers and struggles international students face to varying degrees, such as cultural adjustment, mental stress, academic pressure, financial hardships, and homesickness (Hung, 2006; Martirosyan et al., 2015; McMahon, 2018; Wu et al., 2015), they also confront cultural and linguistic challenges upon moving to the U.S. When examining the challenges that international students face, it is vital to avoid generalization. Instead, there is a need to pay close attention to differences among international students since they have contextual and multifaceted needs (Kaya, 2020). As Heng (2018) stated, it was a stereotype and bias to generalize Chinese students as passive, unsocial, and annoying learners without a theoretical framework to examine their experiences in-depth. We need to know what reasons typically cause the students' lack of ability in language, social involvement, and academic performances.

English proficiency. As the predominantly used language in classes, English is a tool with which international students survive and succeed in the U.S. higher institutions. A higher level of English proficiency is a challenge for emergent multilingual students who must meet the requirements of disciplinary knowledge, academic language, and social conventional English skills at the same time (Haan et al., 2017). To make sure that international students' English skills are proficient enough to fulfill the academic requirements, most American universities need students to pass some standardized English proficiency tests, such as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), as one of the required admission requirements. However, a satisfactory test score is not equivalent to a higher level of ability in listening, speaking, reading, and writing English. In Heng's (2018) study, which focused on the challenges of Chinese undergraduate students who were admitted to U.S. universities, he found that participants felt inadequate in their English foundation knowledge, particularly in speaking, writing, and logical thinking skills. The Chinese students achieved the required English proficiency test scores but still struggled with communicating in English, understanding lectures, and writing assignments. One of the reasons for their successful proficiency scores stems from intensive test training courses, which emphasize exam techniques over language skills (Ravichandran et al., 2017; Tung, 2016).

In the study by Ravichandran et al. (2017), researchers found their participants who were 15 international graduate students representing 11 countries from various fields of study faced

language challenges tied to academic performance. The results of their study showed that writing was the most challenging language skill for international graduate students, especially in "English grammar and vocabulary, style guide use, organization and flow of information, critical thinking, understanding of plagiarism, and assignment completion time" (p. 772). Because there is a positive correlation between international students' English language ability (writing, reading, listening, speaking) and their academic performance (measured by GPA; Martirosyan et al., 2015), international students who struggle with English may have anxiety that weakens their academic performances in higher education.

Other researchers (e.g., Daller & Phelan, 2013; Gautam et al., 2016; Li et al., 2010) also found that language proficiency is the key determinant that could influence international students' academic performance and international students whose first language is one other than English would take a longer time to master academic skills in the host country. Therefore, Martirosyan et al. (2015) stated that professors in different disciplines are critical to support the students' English language needs by building up an international student-friendly environment and providing appropriate courses, tutoring, and pedagogical strategies. In addition, Roy (2013) demonstrated that the differences between Asian (Chinese, Japanese, and Korean) international students' native language systems and English had caused their insufficient English proficiency. She pointed out that the American professors' teaching styles and language usages, such as using idioms, jokes, colloquialisms, and complex sentences, also created barriers for the international students' understanding of the content of lectures.

Social isolation. In addition to language challenges and academic pressure, international students also face cultural shock and social disconnections. Social isolation is a common issue among international students, and it has been reflected in many studies (Kaya, 2020; Martirosyan et al., 2015; Ravichandran et al., 2017; Tung, 2016). This phenomenon was caused by many reasons, such as personalities, language deficiencies, unfamiliarity with the culture (Tung, 2016), and having no access to get involved in social activities (Kaya, 2020). Lack of social activities could impact international students' mental health and academic performance. There were many suggested solutions, for example, providing opportunities for international students to interact with domestic students who can help with their social adjustment (Martirosyan et al., 2015), and pairing international students and local students as language peers, or setting up a community for conversations and sharing different perspectives (Lin & Scherz, 2014).

Even though many universities provided opportunities to promote intercultural communication between local and international students, the outcomes did not fulfill the goals. From international students' perspective, it is hard to build up friendships, enhance their English language skills, and get a deeper understanding of American culture through limited communication times with native-English speakers (Kaya, 2020). Also, Ravichandran et al. (2017) found that conversational partners did not work well because the communication was not consistent. Some native English-speaking peers were not talkative or had no knowledge to start a conversation with a non-native speaker. Some of them just showed up one or two times and never contacted the international students because of their schedule. Therefore, many international students were still in a socially isolated situation and had limited opportunities to enhance their English and understanding of the culture outside of the classrooms.

In Tung's (2016) study, Chinese international students' social isolation in the U.S. was caused by lack of knowledge of western culture and their cultural heritage and traditions. These studies clearly revealed that these challenges were caused by the differences between students'

cultural and educational background but not their learning skills or abilities. Hence, it is critical to look beyond the international students' challenges and to avoid assumptions before constructing a supportive curriculum, a class, a strategy, or practices. In the next section, the literature review focuses on faculty's perspectives on international students and CRT/CLR practices.

Faculty's Views on International Students and CRT/CLR Practices

It is also necessary to think from the faculty's perspective in terms of the trend of "internationalization" in the context of higher education. What are faculty facing when they have international students in their classes, yet they lack adequate awareness and training? How do faculty understand CRT or CLR practices in academia with full teaching and research loads? Among 21 reviewed articles, only eight of them addressed this issue and studied the faculty's position towards international students as well as CLR practices. Compared to the other three themes (see Table 1), faculty's opinions and experiences are underrepresented in the literature.

Faculty's challenges. According to Haan et al. (2017), although internationalization benefits the host campus, local students, and international students, both students and faculty face challenges caused by cultural and linguistic differences. This issue is more obvious for emergent multilinguals who need to meet the requirements of disciplinary knowledge, academic language, and social conventional English skills at the same time. Haan et al. (2017) stated that international students have been considered as guests but never a host in the university. They may not have the power to request that the dominant schooling system make accommodations for their cultural and linguistic needs. From the faculty's perspective, it is not acceptable to lower the curricular standards to satisfy the students. Rather, it is the students' responsibility to fit in the mainstream culture and meet the standards (Hann et al., 2017). Also, when faculty are expected to adjust their teaching and curriculum, it is necessary to consider the professional training, guidance, and even allowances to support their efforts. Without any agreement between the school leaders and faculty on the goals of recruiting and cultivating international students, it is hard to expect outcomes of successful international education. As stated in Ravichandran et al. (2017), it is not enough to recruit international students but ignore their unique cultural and linguistic needs. In most studies, researchers found that faculty welcome internationalization and international students, but they also face unique challenges and have low self-efficacy in serving this group of students' needs (Hann et al., 2017; Jin & Schneider, 2019; Washburn & Hargis, 2017).

To illustrate, in Washburn and Hargis' (2017) case study, they interviewed nine faculty in three distinct U.S. universities and found four themes of faculty's challenges that emerged from transcripts coded by a cross-case analysis method. The themes included language/cultural challenges, teaching and learning challenges, ethnic perceptions, and enrollment desires. First, the presence of international students may have impacted the dynamics in the classroom because of cultural and linguistic differences. Some faculty stated that they need to learn about cultures and be sure that the local students can respect the international students' cultures as well. Meanwhile, faculty need to make a balance between international students and local students' needs because they cannot pay too much attention to international students and neglect local students. Also, they expressed that international students' various levels of English proficiency impacted the depth of their instruction. Second, faculty face challenges regarding instructional preparation and adjustments to create a more inclusive learning environment. Some of them said that they need support from the administration before preparing classes, otherwise faculty members were not able to make any adjustments since students' names alone do not suffice for information about cultural

differences before the start of the semester. Third, faculty also experience ethnic challenges with various cultures in the classroom.

As Kisch (2014) discussed, university professors face challenges when they have an increasing number of international students with diverse cultural backgrounds. For example, they may not be aware of the cultural norms in different countries, such as gender separation during group work for students from Saudi Arabia. Washburn and Hargis (2017) also found that faculty prefer European students over Asian students because of their more potent English abilities and similar cultural backgrounds. The last challenge mentioned in the study is the enrollment pressure the faculty face. The researchers found that faculty stressed giving international students' passing grades "regardless of their academic abilities" (p. 14) because their schools would like to keep the students for financial revenues and religious missions. Overall, the faculty in this small-sample study showed a positive attitude towards international students. Still, they were also stressed with enrolling a larger number of culturally and linguistically diverse students in the face of limited support from the administration.

Faculty's attitudes on hosting and teaching international students. Even though faculty face multifaceted challenges in supporting international students, they held a positive attitude towards internationalization and having more international students (Hann et al., 2017; Jin & Schneider, 2019). In Jin and Schneider's (2019) empirical study, the results showed that faculty held a positive stance of hosting international students on campus and would like work with them for the following reasons: "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" (p. 89). Also, the researchers found that faculty could understand the challenges that international students face, which had been categorized as "academic challenges, sociocultural challenges, and other challenges related to finances, legal status, and professional aspirations" (p. 89). However, faculty have low self-efficacy in serving international students' needs and have a high ratio of negative responses regarding the level of support the university was providing for the students (Hann et al., 2017). Faculty felt that international students' cultural and linguistic characteristics could become obstacles for them to teach, which indicated a negative attitude toward the need to adjust teaching methods (Jin & Schneider, 2019). The faculty also believed that the primary supports should be "outside of the classroom" (p. 44), since the university received the benefits from recruiting international students whereas faculty did not receive additional benefits, such as a salary increase (Hann et al., 2017).

University level CRT/CLR/LRI support. To explore what efforts universities made to support international students, Martirosyan et al. (2019) examined academic and social support services provided to international students by reviewing websites of the top 20 universities with the greatest enrollment of international students in 2016. Among the top 20 institutions, the percentage of international student enrollment ranged from over 10% to over 40% of the overall student population. The researchers categorized six themes from content analysis of academic and social services offered by the institutions: English language programs, academic support and student success initiatives, targeted writing support, social and cultural events, professional development workshops, and family member programs. These services were free of charge to international students except the English language programs. Most of these language programs focused on general English skills, instead of the language that is connected to the students' content area. There is only one institution that offers English courses in students' specific disciplines (Boston

University Global Programs) in addition to general English language classes. This indicates a gap between English language acquisition and content knowledge learning in the English language preparation programs. Also, only one institution provided speech therapy to all students who needed accent modification. Several universities provided English Conversation Hours and Language Exchange for international students to communicate or to pair up with local students. These are chances to improve their English proficiency and get to know peers from the same discipline. However, there is no data to show how many students utilize these services or their feedback about their effects. The other services, such as academic support (online or face-to-face workshops and webinars) and writing support, were available to all students at the university. Among 20 institutions, there is only one university that provides writing consultants for graduate students who need to improve their writing skills and navigate graduate life.

From this study, it is obvious that the packaged services are not customized for international students. The English language program charged extra and was disconnected from students' content knowledge. In addition, this study was based on descriptions of universities' websites that tended to recruit more international students, therefore, it was not reflective of the users' perspectives. For example, many schools include writing centers to improve writing ability, however, there was no evidence on how international students benefit from this service when they meet difficulties in their disciplines. Furthermore, none of the websites mentioned the support that international students could get from faculty in their disciplines.

From these studies, it is evident that faculty have dichotomous views on international education and students. On one hand, they understand the challenges that international students face and most faculty participants in the studies agreed that international students needed extra attention and support not only in the class but also from the administration. On the other hand, faculty faced challenges in learning the international students' cultures and languages to facilitate their academic work. To be specific, they were also expecting support to create an inclusive classroom and construct an effective teaching environment that could meet both international students and local students' needs. Furthermore, the services that universities provided are not adequate to support international students' English language and content knowledge learning. Fortunately, many researchers and educators (Gallagher & Haan, 2018; Gopal, 2011; Haan et al., 2017; Roy, 2013) paid attention to the gap between students' and faculty's challenges and the resources provided for them. They emphasized the importance to equip faculty with CRP/CLRLRI knowledge and implement CRP/CLR/LRI related practices to teaching, since CPR/CLR/LRI practices can benefit students (Hoekje & Stevens, 2018). Therefore, the following studies focused on CLR teaching practices that could be incorporated into higher education.

Suggested CRP/CLR Related Practices for Higher Education Educators
The previous sections demonstrate that both international students and faculty face dilemmas in higher education. Even though CRP/CLR /LRI practices are an effective framework to serve multilingual and multicultural students, it is challenging to articulate CRP/CLR/LRI practices or frameworks in higher education because of its complex and multidimensional features (Han et al., 2014). Applying CRP/CLR/LRI practices to the U.S. higher institutions involves multiple layers of understanding about culture, language, educational differences, teachers' cognition, students' backgrounds, classroom practices, and administrators' efforts. The following section describes practices that could support faculty understanding international students' linguistic and cultural needs in higher education.

Professional Development

First and foremost, it is necessary to provide professional development (PD) opportunities to prepare the faculty's mindsets and intercultural competencies for teaching international students. As Arthur (2017) states, "many faculty members in higher education are appointed due to their expertise in an academic discipline and they may not receive formal training in pedagogical practices for supporting international students" (p. 889). Gopal (2011) asserts that it is difficult for faculty to provide equitable learning opportunities to international students if there is no adequate and systematic cross-cultural training. Haan et al. (2017) advocated PD in Linguistically Responsive Instruction (LRI) for faculty because "using linguistically-responsive and supportive practices and responding flexibly to students' varying needs promotes equitable educational outcomes for all students." (p. 48). Gallagher and Haan (2018) also state that faculty need to understand the knowledge of second language acquisition as well as linguistically responsive teaching practices to support students' language development.

Since faculty are vital resources for international students to make connections and adjust to the local context, it is essential to introduce the unique characteristics and challenges international students have in the new faculty orientation and ongoing professional development sessions (Arthur, 2017). When discussing the faculty's responses toward time limitation for the professional development of learning pedagogical practices of LRI, Gallagher and Haan (2018) proposed a "university-wide effort to involve all stakeholders in planning for supporting faculty, staff, and student success throughout the internationalization process and clearly communicating these decisions and plans to all" (p. 318).

Faculty's beliefs. First, faculty must learn to be open to other cultures and to avoid ethnocentricity which is the belief that one culture is superior to the others. According to Arthur (2017), ethnocentrism is problematic in the curriculum since it privileges local practices and neglects students' voices from other cultures. Teaching international students provides faculty an opportunity to examine their own cultural awareness, which allows them to understand their identities and cultures from a different perspective. Gopal (2011) stated that intercultural competency is essential "for navigating the continuum of globalization" (p. 379). Both Gopal (2011) and Roy (2013) emphasized the core elements of developing faculty's intercultural competence included self-reflection and self-awareness of cultural differences. It starts with faculty's attitudes of valuing students who have diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, beliefs, and habits of learning. It requires faculty awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills (Roy, 2013) to realize the international students' learning habits and struggles. Faculty in international education also need to be aware that international students are not a homogeneous group. While delivering instructions (Roy, 2013) and developing programs and curriculum (Arthur, 2017), it is important for faculty to consider the impact of international students' identities on their academic performances (Arthur, 2017; Roy, 2013).

To achieve the goal, Roy (2013) provided American professors recommendations in their work with Chinese, Japanese, and Korean international students. For instance, professors need to be aware of the meaning of students' body language because the students may feel uncomfortable asking questions in class or have difficulties expressing their feelings in English. Also, professors need to understand the process and stages of international students' English language development. Roy listed methods to help overcome the language barriers between students and professors, such as using translating tools and providing notes ahead of classes. More importantly, Roy pointed out that professors need to be empathetic to what international students are experiencing to overcome

language and life challenges for their academic goals and be respectful to their efforts. Even though Roy's article focused on Chinese, Japanese, and Korean students who shared a culture distinct from that of western and local students, the strategies can be useful in other settings to support international students from other countries.

Kisch (2014) also provided ten practical tips for faculty to support international students, such as "being proactive in communicating with international students, normalizing office hours, checking in with students after assigning group work, talking to students individually and encouraging them to share their unique perspectives, and clarifying expectations from students" (p. 46). These tips and suggestions aim to with examining faculty's beliefs while working with international students. Because "teachers' beliefs, pedagogical approaches, and resources" (Li, 2020, p. 35) are all important in fostering the language learners' active learning attitude.

In addition to emphasizing the importance of faculty's self-reflection and self-awareness, Arthur (2017) listed two other key factors that could support international students' transition to the host country: counselors who can help with initial adjustment and culture shock, and local students who could also benefit from interaction with international students. Meanwhile, merely putting international students and local students together does not always promote cross-cultural interactions. It is a complicated and stressful process since "interacting with people from different cultures can create feelings of uncertainty and anxiety" (Gopal, 2011, p. 379). Effective and mutual learning happens in more structured, collaborative, and scaffolded activities (Arthur, 2017). In other words, it takes systematic efforts to increase the quality of international education, not just the quantity of recruited students. In addition to suggestions on faculty PD, some researchers introduced models and strategies to alleviate the challenges that international students and faculty face.

Program design. Kisch (2014) introduces a one-stop service that integrates academic, immigration, and student/community engagement for international students and faculty at Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) in the U.S. According to Kisch, the International Student and Scholar program contributed to international students' retention by 3.7% from 2008 to 2013. Shane et al. (2020) introduced a first-term foundation course that is required for all international graduate students who received their undergraduate or higher degrees from countries other than the U.S. The 11-week course's overarching goal was to improve international students' academic skills and build their self-confidence in English oral and written communication. There were several advantages of the program. First, to ensure that instructors know each students' challenges well, the class size was limited to 16 students. Second, the course scaffolded the students in different areas but was not limited to academic skills. For example, students had opportunities to interact with native English speakers and build up their social network at a place called *Communication Cafe*. To keep the program running, all the native speakers were volunteers who earned points for classes. The instructors also directed students to participate in various on-campus clubs and other university events. Furthermore, the course covered required knowledge for success in the graduate programs, such as presentation skills, academic honesty, and creative thinking skills.

Classroom practices. In terms of strategies to help international students alleviate academic and social challenges, there are practical suggestions that could be integrated into the classroom teaching in U.S. higher education system. The suggestions provided by Crose (2011), Gallagher and Haan (2018), and Ravichandran et al. (2017) are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Classroom Practices that Alleviate Challenges

Instructional Strategies	▪ Provide explicit and constructive feedback on assignments, not only research ideas but also grammatical usage. ▪ Pay more attention to linguistic errors on the writing assignments. ▪ Provide printed handouts to students and allow students to record the classes. ▪ Introduce a variety of assessment methods and grading rubrics. To provide formative feedback. ▪ Eliminate timed writing assignments to ensure students have enough time to have a deeper reflection on their writing.
Classroom Environment	▪ Create an inviting classroom environment by not skewing to the host culture. ▪ Cultivate an internationalized classroom: encourage the local students to interact with international students who view the interaction as opportunities to improve their English and integrate into the host culture. ▪ Utilize techniques to help international students overcome the language barriers, such as further explanation of slang or an outline of key concepts of a lecture. ▪ Involve international students in classroom discussion and facilitate the discussions by providing opportunities for students to know each other before dividing them into small groups. Provide discussion topics in advance so students will be more prepared. Provide feedback, not a grade only. ▪ Organize group-oriented activities in the international classroom. Design collaborative group activities to understand interpersonal communication better, for example, learn to pronounce students' names correctly.
Student Services	▪ ESL services: it is better to have a department-specific trained ESL personnel to assist graduate-level academic writing. ▪ Orientation programs: provide more information and include more specific information about how to succeed academically.

Writing instruction. One of the biggest challenges reflected by international students is their English writing competence. Further, the faculty in the writing programs also struggled with teaching multilingual writers because they lack specialized training in this area (Schneider, 2018). Schneider (2018) offered five macro-topics related to college writing to expand writing instructors' and professionals' understanding of teaching multilingual students, which the researcher believed that was necessary for faculty with an increasing number of diverse students with different linguistic backgrounds. The first topic is the *Nature of Second Language Writers* which could help faculty understand the differences between international students and immigrant/resident ESL students. Therefore, Schneider suggested distinct paths for various types of multilingual writers in the first-year writing curriculum. The second topic is to help faculty understand the *Theories of Second Language Development* which implies that second language learning is a lifelong process. Faculty, especially the writing instructors need to understand that it takes years to achieve academic proficiency in an additional language. The third topic is *Assignment Design and Teacher Response,* which suggests that writing assignments for L2 learners should be different from L1 students. Meanwhile, multilingual students benefited from instructors' explicit, constructive, and responsive feedback on their writing, especially in language and grammar. The fourth topic talked about *Grammar* which Schneider (2018) believed that "teachers absolutely must have solid knowledge of descriptive grammar in order to make well- founded pedagogic choices in relation

to multilingual students — or any other students" (p. 361). Hence, he recommended writing instructors to get equipped with descriptive linguistics as well as pedagogical grammar knowledge. The last topic Schneider introduced was *Sociolinguistics,* which emphasized the connection between language and "social, political, and economic power" (p. 363). To this extent, understanding monolingualism, multilingualism, translingualism, and code-meshing in the field of writing studies is essential for teaching diverse learners.

Based on the macro-topics, Schneider (2018) outlined four suggestions that could incorporate applied linguistics to improve language learners' writing competence in higher education. One of those is to provide professional development in applied linguistics for faculty so they can integrate the knowledge to daily practices. This article was a strong argument in supporting educators to be linguistically and culturally responsive writing instructors. Regarding writing support for international students, Gallagher and Haan (2018) suggested providing a full-time writing tutor who can communicate in the students' first languages. Researchers stated that services provided by the University Writing Center were not enough to support international students, especially for those in the graduate programs, because the content of their papers could not be addressed (Gallagher & Haan, 2018; Ravichandran et al., 2017).

In sum, international students are part of the multilingual student population, and they are overwhelmed by the academic writing challenges. They need language support from their subject teachers. As stated by Haan et al. (2017), "all faculty are instructors of language in their disciplines" (p. 47). Gallagher and Haan (2018) listed some strategies that could be applied to disciplinary classes, including "focusing on language demands of the disciplinary tasks, offering opportunities for student interaction, creating a supportive classroom environment, supplementing oral and written texts, scaffolding learning, and providing feedback on both disciplinary and language content" (p. 316). The practices introduced above could inform faculty's perspectives in teaching L2 learners with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and help faculty understand and learn strategies to apply to their classroom teaching.

Discussion and Implications

Overall, researchers employed qualitative and quantitative methods to examine international education in U.S. institutions of higher education. The topics included the challenges faced by students and faculty, CLR teaching practices, faculty beliefs, and recommendations for staff and administrators. The literature indicates that international students and faculty face challenges in terms of language, culture, classroom discussion, academic expectations, as well as adjustment to each other. International students' prior educational, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds are their funds of knowledge but also obstacles to adopt into a new learning environment. Transitioning from one culture to another, the conflicts between different systems and values cause new international students to feel confused, lost, and uncomfortable (Arthur, 2017). However, it is clearly shown that faculty's perspectives are less discussed in the literature. More research, especially large-scale empirical studies focusing on faculty's experiences are needed in the future to better understand and support the needs of those who teach international students.

From the literature review, it is obvious that faculty is seen as a vital resource for international students' development in cognition, language, social interactions, and academic performance. In a diverse classroom where students share multicultural identities, faculty's scaffolding and supportive activities could lead students through their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)—"the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through

problem-solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86)—and achieve their potential. One important factor to consider in teaching international students is that it takes years of exposure for them to gain confidence when speaking a different language and participating in a new culture (Martirosyan et al., 2015). Therefore, during curriculum design and classroom teaching, instructors need to be aware that the newcomers are experiencing a long and challenging process to understand and accommodate the mainstream norms.

Also, students bring an abundance of prior knowledge to the class, which also greatly impacts their learning and understanding (Rosenblatt, 1994). Thus, it is beneficial for faculty to understand students' cultural and language backgrounds during curriculum planning and instruction delivery. Rather than judging all students' performances with the same standards, neglecting students' diverse backgrounds, and marginalizing the international students because of their special needs, it is vital to take them into consideration during classroom instruction. To achieve the goals, researchers recommended professional development and various CLR practices for faculty to support multilingual and multicultural students. The suggestions covered teachers' beliefs, building social connections, program design, classroom practices, and writing instruction. In general, the suggestions will likely benefit both faculty and students. However, most of the literature had small sample sizes or were conducted in one university. Some suggestions were from faculty's own experiences of working with international students. Therefore, the practices may not fit into other institutions. Another finding from the literature is that there is a lack of clarity about roles of supporting international students. The international offices at some universities provide immigration information. Their primary goal is to make sure that the international students obey U.S. laws and regulations. The faculty's primary responsibility focuses on serving local students and the community. An executive order like International Initiatives is not motivated enough to promote a change in their curriculum and teaching if faculty's needs, working load, and expectations are not considered. The criteria of evaluating international education were too vague as well. Therefore, future research needs to investigate international students' feedback towards these practices and compare their academic performances between groups with and without CLR support.

It is also necessary to examine the issue from a critical stance and see how power and people's mindsets impact their practices. On one hand, faculty held a positive attitude towards diversity, globalization, internationalization, and international students on campus. On the other hand, without appropriate training, faculty's monolingualist beliefs and the perception of superiority of Western values may leave few spaces for equal intercultural communication. Nonetheless, researchers found a significant relationship between faculty background and their beliefs about international students. Compared to English monolingual faculty, faculty who have similar experiences to international students, such as studying abroad and speaking more than one language, were able to understand and empathize with them better (Jin & Schneider, 2019). It is clear that faculty were expecting more support from other departments, such as the international office, writing centers, and graduate offices. However, these services provided by U.S. higher institutions would be superficial to meet international students' linguistic and cultural differences if they mainly focus on serving domestic students. Hoekje and Stevens (2018) believed that it is necessary to challenge the belief that "U.S. higher education can continue to open its doors to the world's students without changing anything beyond the obvious student services" (p. 12), because it takes efforts from administrators, faculty, and cultural gatekeepers to create a linguistically and

culturally diverse environment that could lead to a transformation of the campus ecosystem under the initiative of internationalization.

To sum up, the literature review aims to challenge the normativity of the value of international education and international students by examining CLR practices to support international students and faculty holistically in the U.S. higher education. Since "power is involved in the determination of what will or should be learned and in how that learning will be supported and measured" (Esmonde & Booker, 2017, p. 168), it is crucial to consider if current policy, system, curriculum design, and assessment standards have taken account of international students and faculty's needs. In general, there is much more to do to build up a truly international, intercultural, and diverse environment for students, especially international students who brought their linguistic and cultural experiences to the host country but were not valued. International students should be supported at an institutional level not only because of their rights but also their contributions to the hosting institutions and local economy (Martirosyan et al., 2019). As stated by Arthur (2017), "an absence of content about international perspectives, misinformed, or stereotypical interpretations of international practices may perpetuate bias and historical biases of colonialism and racism, at minimum resulting in student disinterest or dissatisfaction with the quality of their educational experiences" (p. 888). This is a call for attention to unfold the beliefs and practices of international education in the U.S. higher education. With the efforts from faculty, staff, scholars, and students from multiple cultures, we can build linguistic and culturally diverse spaces in academia that could benefit all.

References

Arthur, N. (2017). Supporting international students through strengthening their social resources. *Studies in Higher Education*, *42*(5), 887–894. https://doi.oeg/10.1080/03075079.2017.1293876

Bilash, O. (2011). BICS/CALP: Basic interpersonal communicative skills vs. cognitive academic language proficiency. https://bestofbilash.ualberta.ca/bics%20calp.html

Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction.* Belkapp Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1971). *The relevance of education*. Norton.

Bruner, J. S. (1996). *The culture of education*. Harvard University Press.

Contreras-Aguirre, C. H., & Gonzalez, G. E. (2017). Experiences of international female students in U.S. graduate programs. *College Student Journal, 51*(1), 33–46.

Crose, B. (2011). Internationalization of the higher education classroom: Strategies to facilitate intercultural learning and academic success. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *23*(3), 388–395. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ946165.pdf

Cummins, J. (1981). Empirical and theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education. *Journal of Education*, *163*(1), 16–29. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42772934

Daller, M. H., & Phelan, D. (2013). Predicting international student study success. *Applied Linguistics Review, 4*(1), 173–193. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0008

de Jong, E. J., Harper, C. A., & Coady, M. R. (2013). Enhanced knowledge and skills for elementary mainstream teachers of English language learners. *Theory Into Practice, 52*(2), 89–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.770326

Esmonde, I., & Booker, A. N. (2017). Toward critical sociocultural theories of learning. In I. Esmonde & A. N. Booker (Eds.), *Power and privilege in the learning sciences* (pp. 180–192). Routledge.

Gallagher, C. E., & Haan, J. E. (2018). University faculty beliefs about emergent multilinguals and linguistically responsive instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, *52*(2), 304–330. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.399

Gautam, C., Lowery, C. L., Mays, C., & Durant, D. (2016). Challenges for global learners: A qualitative study of the concerns and difficulties of international students. *Journal of International Students*, *6*(2), 501–526. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v6i2.368

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice.* Teachers College Press.

Gopal, A. (2011). Internationalization of higher education: Preparing faculty to teach cross-culturally. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *23*(3), 373–381. https://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/pdf/IJTLHE1028.pdf

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 & Learning*, *17*(1), 37–51. https://doi.org/10.14434/v17i1.20008

Han, H., S., Vomvoridi-Ivanović, E., Jacobs, J., Karanxha, Z., Lypka, A., Topdemir, C., & Feldman, A. (2014). Culturally responsive pedagogy in higher education: A collaborative self-study. *Studying Teacher Education*, *10*(3), 290–312. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2014.958072

Heng, T. T. (2018). Different is not deficient: Contradicting stereotypes of Chinese international students in U.S. higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 43*(1), 22–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1152466

Hoekje, B. J., & Stevens, S. G. (2018). *Creating a culturally inclusive campus: A guide to supporting international students*. Routledge.

Hollie, S. (2017). *Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and learning: Classroom practices for student success*. Teacher Created Materials.

Hollins, E. R. (2008). *Culture in school learning: Revealing the deep meaning.* Taylor and Francis.

Hung, H. (2006). What is missing in U.S. higher education: Looking into the learning experiences of Asian international students from cognitive and sociocultural perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *3*(2), 168–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/15505170.2006.10411611

Institute of International Education. (2019, November 18). *Number of international students in the United States hits all-time high*. https://www.iie.org/Why-IIE/Announcements/2019/11/Number-of-International-Students-in-the-United-States-Hits-All-Time-High

Irvine, J. J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye.* Teachers College Press.

Israel, E., & Batalova, J. (2021, January 14). *International students in the United States.* Migration Policy Institute. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/international-students-united-states-2020#enrollment_numbers_trends

Jin, L., & Schneider, J. (2019). Faculty views on international students: A survey study. *Journal of International Students*, *9*(1), 84–99. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v9i1.268

Kasun, G. S. (2015). "The only Mexican in the room": *Sobrevivencia* as a way of knowing for Mexican transnational students and families. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *46*(3), 277–294. https://doi.org/10.1111/aeq.12107

Kaya, J. (2020). Inside the international student world: Challenges, opportunities, and imagined communities. *Journal of International Students*, *10*(1), 124–144. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v10i1.1031

Kibelloh, M., & Bao, B. (2014). Perceptions of international female students toward e-learning in resolving high education and family role strain. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *50*(4), 467–487. https://doi.org/10.2190/EC.50.4.b

Kisch, M. (2014). Helping faculty teach international students. *International Educator*, *23*(6), 44–47. https://www.nafsa.org/sites/default/files/ektron/files/underscore/ie_novdec14_fsa.pdf

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 257–277). Sage.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). It's your world, I'm just trying to explain it: Understanding our epistemological and methodological challenges. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *9*(1), 5–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800402239333

Lee, J. J., & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of discrimination. *Higher Education, 53*(3), 381–409. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-005-4508-3

Lewis, C., Enciso, P., & Moje, E. B. (2012). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power*. Routledge.

Li, G. (2020). Principles for developing learner agency in language learning in a new eduscape with COVID-19. *Language Learning*, *5*, 30–40.

Li, G., Chen, W., & Duanmu, J.-L. (2010). Determinants of international students' academic performance: A comparison between Chinese and other international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14*(4), 389–405. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315309331490

Lin, S. Y., & Scherz, S. D. (2014). Challenges facing Asian international graduate students in the U.S.: Pedagogical considerations in higher education. *Journal of International Students*, *4*(1), 16–33.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, *52*(2), 98–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.770327

Martirosyan, N. M., Bustamantea, R. M., & Saxon, D. P. (2019). Academic and social support services for international students: Current practices. *Journal of international Students*, *9*(1), 172–191. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v9i1.275

Martirosyan, N. M., Eunjin Hwang, & Wanjohi, R. (2015). Impact of English proficiency on academic performance of international students. *Journal of International Students*, *5*(1), 60–71. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v5i1.443

McMahon, P. (2018). 'Making the grade': A grounded theory explaining the student experience of Asian and Middle-Eastern postgraduates in a British university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *40(*1), 34–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2017.1411061

Moje, E. B, & Lewis, C. (2012). Examining opportunities to learn literacy: The role of critical sociocultural literacy research. In C. Lewis, P. Enciso, & E. B. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power* (pp. 15–48). Routledge.

NAFSA. (2021). *Economic value statistics*. https://www.nafsa.org/policy-and-advocacy/policy-resources/nafsa-international-student-economic-value-tool-v2

Potts, K., & Brown, L. (2005). Becoming an anti-oppressive researcher. In L. A. Brown & S. Strega (Eds.). *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches*. Canadian Scholars' Press.

Ravichandran, S., Kretovics, M., Kirby, K., & Ghosh, A. (2017). Strategies to address English language writing challenges faced by international graduate students in the U.S. *Journal of International Students*, *7*(3), 3–7. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.570033

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1994). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 1057–1092). International Reading Association.

Roy, S. R. (2013). Educating Chinese, Japanese, and Korean international students: Recommendations to American professors. *Journal of International Students*, *3*(1), 10–16. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v3i1.514

Schneider, J. (2018). Learning how to support multilingual writers: A framework for faculty education. *Pedagogy*, *18*(2), 345–374. https://doi.org/10.1215/15314200-4359245

Shane, M. J., Carson, L., & Macri, D. G. (2020). First term support for international graduate students attending small colleges and universities. *Journal of International Students*, *10*(2), 527–538. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v10i2.1126

Tung, M. L. (2016). The roots of the challenge: Undergraduate Chinese students adjusting to American college life. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *5*(3), 121–130. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v5n3p121

Ültanır, E. (2012). An epistemological glance at the constructivist approach: Constructivist learning in Dewey, Piaget, and Montessori. *International Journal of Instruction*, *5*(2), 195–212. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED553786.pdf

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological*. Harvard University Press.

Washburn, C., & Hargis, J. (2017). Changes in faculty practice for international students: A case study. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, *10*(1), 1–18. https://journals.kpu.ca/index.php/td/article/view/949

Wu, H., Garza, E, & Guzman, N. (2015). International student's challenge and adjustment to college. *Educational Research International*, *2015*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/202753

_____

Appendix Table

Literature Collected and Analyzed

No.	Literature	Research Type	Method	Participants	Location	*Benefits*	*Challenges*	*Faculty Views*	*Suggested Practices*
1	Arthur (2017)	Commentary	N/A	N/A	N/A		*		*
2	Crose (2011)	Conceptual	N/A	N/A	N/A	*	*		*
3	Gautam et al. (2016)	Empirical	Online survey and interview	28 survey respondents and 6 interviewees (international students)	A U.S. university in a small town in the southern region	*	*		*
4	Gallagher & Haan (2018)	Empirical	Surveys	197 faculty	Mid-size comprehensive university in midwestern United States	*	*	*	*
5	Gopal (2011)	Conceptual	N/A	N/A	N/A				*
6	Han et al. (2014)	Empirical	Collaborative self-study	7 teacher educators	College of Education at the University of South Florida			*	*
7	Haan et al. (2017)	Empirical	Self-reported online survey (12 Likert items and open-ended items)	192 respondents (among over 500 full-time and adjunct faculty)	Mid-size, private, comprehensive university in the U.S.	*	*	*	*
8	Heng (2018)	Empirical	Demographic questionnaire, 3 semi-structured interviews, and 4	18 Chinese undergraduates	Three private, four-year, liberal arts colleges in a large city in		*		

#									
			journal entries throughout an academic year		North East USA				
9	Jin & Schneider (2019)	Empirical	Online survey	261 respondents (full-time and part-time faculty)	A comprehensive private university in the Midwest U.S.		*	*	
10	Kaya (2020)	Empirical	Interviews	5 international graduate students	A midwestern U.S. university	*	*	*	*
11	Kisch (2014)	Commentary	N/A	N/A	N/A		*	*	*
12	Lin & Scherz (2014)	Empirical	Interviews	5 Asian international graduate students	A Medium-sized university in the Northwest of the United States		*		*
13	Martirosyan et al. (2015)	Empirical	Self-reported questionnaire	59 international undergraduate students	4-year university in north central Louisiana	*	*		
14	Martirosyan et al. (2019)	Exploratory	Analyze website content	Top 20 universities with greatest enrollment of international students in 2016	United States	*	*		*
15	Ravichandran et al. (2017)	Empirical	Semi-structured interviews	15 international graduate students	United States	*	*	*	*
16	Roy (2013)	Conceptual	N/A	N/A	United States		*		*
17	Schneider (2018)	Conceptual	N/A	N/A	United States		*		*
18	Shane et al. (2020)	Descriptive	Discuss a required first-term foundation	An 11-week course	A small, private institution in Southern	*	*		*

No.	Author	Type	Method	Participants	Location	Benefits	Challenges	Faculty Views	Suggested Practices
			course for international graduate students		California				
19	Tung (2016)	Conceptual	Literature review	Chinese students	U.S. higher education	*	*		*
20	Washburn & Hargis (2017)	Empirical	Interviews	9 faculty	3 higher institutions in the Western U.S.		*	*	*
21	Wu et al. (2015)	Empirical	Interviews	10 international students	Southernmost part of the U.S.	*	*		*
No.	**21**					**11**	**19**	**8**	**18**

Note. Benefits = Benefits/value of embracing international students; *Challenges* = International students' challenges; *Faculty Views* = Faculty's views on international students and CRT/CLR/LRI practices; *Suggested Practices* = Suggested CLR/CLR/LRI practices