

Reframing Internationalization: Faculty Beliefs and Teaching Practices

Marco J. Tulluck

A dissertation in practice submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctorate of Education

In Educational Leadership

University of Washington Tacoma

June 2019

Supervisory Committee:

Jeffrey Cohen, Ph.D., Chair

Turan Kayaoglu, Ph.D., Member

Megan Abbey, J.D., Member

Program Authorized to Offer Degree: University of Washington Tacoma

Education Program

Abstract

This study applies Critical Race Theory as a critical lens to gain a clearer understanding of highly racialized policies and teaching practices around international student engagement in US higher education. The findings help to inform higher education leaders of how to support faculty to foster more inclusive and affirming learning environments for international students of color and other diverse student populations.

This mixed methods study employed a modified version of the Colorblind and Multicultural Ideology of STEM Faculty Measure as well as focus group interviews to gain a more complex understanding of how university faculty members' beliefs align with colorblind ideology and multicultural ideology, and, in turn, the ways in which these ideologies show up in the discourse around how faculty conceptualize their role in creating inclusive and equitable learning environments. This study utilized a purposive sample of 27 faculty at a public research university in the Pacific Northwest, and the trustworthiness of the data was established through member checks, triangulation of methods and sources, and peer debriefing.

The research drew into relief the highly racialized dynamics underlying the discourse of international student engagement, and the findings indicated that racial profiling, white fragility, ideological fragility, deficit-thinking, and stereotype threat all operate on a systemic level to structurally silence and exclude international students of color in US higher education. Additionally, the findings indicated that the voices of international faculty of color and international students of color are crucial to understanding the systemic nature of oppression in US higher education.

Reframing Internationalization: Faculty Beliefs and Teaching Practices

Although higher education in the United States is recognized internationally for its elite degree programs, pedagogical innovations, and technological advancements, international students coming to the United States may not be aware that they are entering into a highly racialized society and an education system that is steeped in the tradition of settler colonialism (Bu, 2001; Fries-Britt, Mwangi, & Peralta, 2014; J. J. Lee & Rice, 2007; J. L. Lee, 2015; Loo, 2019). Critical Race Theory contends that racism permeates and influences the wider context of U.S. higher education as well as the localized context of individual institutions (Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1999). Specifically, academic policies, teaching practices, and textbooks adhere to a white Eurocentric tradition, which centers the curriculum on “white, upper-class, male voicings as the ‘standard’ knowledge students need to know” (Swartz as cited in Ladson-Billings, 1999, p. 21). Consequently, the voices and perspectives of students of color are silenced and invalidated for the purposes of reinforcing and legitimizing a colonial education system custom-tailored to benefit white students (DiAngelo, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Oropeza, Varghese, & Kanno, 2010; Patel, 2016;).

White privilege in U.S higher education is maintained through an ideology of colorblind racism manifested through the use of race-neutral language that avoids, yet implies racial terms (Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Markus, C. Steele, & D. Steele, 2000; McCoy, Winkle-Wagner, & Luedke, 2015; Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009; Plaut, Thomas, Hurd, & Romano, 2018). Bonilla Silva (2014) argues that “ideologies, like grammar, are learned socially and, therefore, the rules of how to speak properly come *naturally* to people socialized in particular societies” (p. 102). This

ideology of colorblind racism is drawn into relief by the standard institutional practices that apply to international students in U.S. higher education, such as English proficiency testing, remedial English as a Second Language (ESL) coursework, and conditional admissions policies. Because of these policies and practices, international students of color are constructed as linguistically, culturally, and academically deficient (Glass, Wongtrirat, & Buus, 2015; Harklau, 1999; Mahboob & Szenes, 2007; Marshall, 2010; Oropeza et al., 2010; Shapiro, 2012).

Moreover, this deficit view of international students in U.S. higher education upholds white privilege. For example, white international students are not necessarily labeled as foreigners, but rather they receive all the privileges and advantages of their citizenship in whiteness (Fries-Britt, et al., 2014; Lee & Rice, 2007; Lee, 2010; Motha, 2014; Oropeza, et al., 2010). Grappling with the colonial trajectories present in the field of English language teaching, Motha (2014) suggests “whiteness has become linked to ownership of English, throwing into question the claim to the language of those not perceived as or coded as white. The dynamic is all the more complicated because while whiteness carries power, it is also understood to be neutral, leading to an invisibility of the privilege it carries” (p. 38). As a result, white international students receive compliments on their sophisticated accent, while international students of color experience accent discrimination (Chan, 2016; Lee & Rice, 2007; Mahboob & Szenes, 2007; Ng, 2007; Oropeza et al., 2010).

Likewise, English proficiency policies and English language assessments are used in higher education to justify discrimination and to normalize the idea that white students are more academically suitable for higher education than students of color (Gillborn, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Mahboob & Szenes, 2007; Ng, 2007). Under this system, inequity becomes the norm. For example, international students of color receive conditional admission status with a

remedial ESL requirement, while white international students receive full admission status without any ESL requirement. Shapiro (2012) describes this institutional practice as “confining students to an ESL ghetto” (p. 240), pointing out that “linguistic difference is seen as a liability, rather than an asset to institutional excellence” (p. 238), with linguistic difference functioning as a proxy for race (J. J. Lee & Rice, 2007; J. L. Lee, 2015).

Racism is reflected and reproduced in the overwhelming amount of deficit-framed research about international students’ challenges with adapting, acculturating, and integrating at U.S. colleges and universities (Marshall, 2010; Montgomery, 2010; Oropeza et al., 2010; Shapiro, 2012). As a result, such literature has reinforced a colonial assimilationist model of internationalization, decentering the uniqueness and complexity of international students’ intersectional identities and devaluing their perspectives, knowledge, and multilingualism (e.g., Holmes, Fanning, Morales, Espinoza, & Herrera, 2012; Hung & Hyun, 2010; Kanno & Grosik, 2012; Wadsworth, Hecht, & Jung, 2008). Moreover, consider how the standard term *international student* assumes a totalizing view of a vastly diverse group of individuals, obscuring aspects of students’ identities such as race, gender, religion, and nationality. This colorblind way of thinking about international students of color is directly linked to the larger colonial notion that students of color are expected to conform to a white Eurocentric education system, or as McCoy et al. (2015) put it, that “students of color will be unsuccessful unless they leave part of themselves *at the schoolhouse door*” (p. 237; emphasis in original).

Similarly, international students of color who study in U.S. institutions of higher education are also expected to leave part of themselves at the schoolhouse door. It follows, then, that institutional claims about valuing internationalization serve to uphold white privilege and to maintain oppressive policies that center white U.S. male monolingual heteronormativity.

Consequently, international student engagement in U.S. institutions of higher education is continually renewed as an issue of integration, echoing deeply problematic colonial notions of assimilation and echoing the larger U.S. presence in the global West as an occupying and imperial power.

Statement of the Problem

Even though the number of international students in the United States has nearly doubled from 582,984 to 1,078,822 students in the past ten years (Institute of International Education, 2017), ideologies of whiteness, xenophobia, and nativism are continually upheld and reinforced in U.S. higher education. As a result, institutions of higher education in the United States claim to value internationalization, diversity, equity, and inclusion, while at the same time maintaining academic policies, curricula, teaching practices, and leadership frameworks that exclude, silence, and colonize international students of color.

Within higher-education practice, the assumption that students are primarily responsible for their own engagement and the notion that all students should receive the same treatment including the same instruction, assignments, assessments, exams, etc. have been normalized. Accordingly, this approach to higher education practice is supported by the argument that any alternative may equate to compromising academic integrity, lowering academic standards, or granting pity passes. However, Critical Race Theory scholars argue that the colorblind ideology underlying this approach actually functions to maintain group-based advantages for the dominant group (white, male, native-English speaking, heterosexual, U.S. students) while at the same time disadvantaging, excluding, and silencing students who do not adhere to this norm (Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Choi, 2008; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, & Chow, 2009; Markus et al., 2000; Plaut et al., 2009; Plaut et al., 2018).

Similarly, student engagement researchers assert that higher education practitioners should provide differentiated and customized educational supports for distinct populations of students in order to ensure more equitable engagement and outcomes for all students (Harper & Quaye, 2015; Pomerantz, 2006; Strayhorn, 20). However, normative supports in higher education are not differentiated, but centered on providing equal support to all students, an idea which can be used to block attempts to offer special efforts to help individual student groups with the greatest needs. Connecting these ideas, we can reasonably conclude that higher education practitioners and faculty members are deeply complicit in upholding and perpetuating systems of privilege and oppression in higher education, even though they may not be aware of or acknowledge it.

However, in the words of James Baldwin (1963), “it is not permissible that the authors of devastation should also be innocent. It is the innocence which constitutes the crime” (pp. 5-6). Although Baldwin’s (1963) compelling voice speaks to the larger context of racism in U.S. society, this framing of the problem captures the reality that racism and other forms of oppression are continually upheld by a failure to acknowledge the problem. Along the same lines, the intense intersectional oppression experienced by international students of color in U.S. higher education is maintained in part by higher education leaders, practitioners, and faculty members who do not acknowledge their own role in perpetuating the problem. As a result of these dynamics, international students of color in the United States continue to experience segregation, both materially and psychically, as they find themselves in an educational system that constructs multilingual students of color as cultural, ethnic, and linguistic *others*.

To more fully understand the contours of this complex problem, internationalization must be considered from an educational leadership framework that considers the key role of the

faculty as both leaders who shape institutional mission, vision, and values and as academics who implement internationalization through teaching, learning, service, and research activities. For this reason, more research is needed to understand faculty members' beliefs and teaching practices for supporting international students and other diverse student groups. Accordingly, the purposes of this study are as follows:

- (a) to measure the degree to which faculty members' beliefs about inclusive teaching practices align with colorblind ideology;
- (b) to understand how faculty members conceptualize and realize their role in creating an inclusive campus for international students and other diverse student populations;
- (c) to draw complex interpretations and inferences about faculty members' beliefs and teaching practices from the analysis of merged quantitative and qualitative data using Critical Race Theory as a theoretical framework.

Justification/Rationale

Although universities claim to value internationalization, diversity, equity, and inclusion, educational leaders are not held responsible to create environments where faculty, staff, and senior administrators establish a shared commitment to those values. In particular, this can be seen in how the concept of internationalization as a symbolic frame typically does not align with the reality of internationalization in U.S. institutions of higher education (Haan, Gallagher, & Varandani, 2017). For instance, U.S. faculty report low self-efficacy in their ability to teach international students, particularly multilingual international students, but at the same time, faculty resist the suggestion that they should change their instruction to meet the needs of multilingual learners (Cao et al., 2014; Haan et al., 2017; Trice, 2003; Trice, 2007). Moreover, research has demonstrated that international students of color in the United States experience

intersectional oppression, silencing, and segregation (Chan, 2016; DiAngelo, 2006; Lee & Rice, 2007; Oropeza et al., 2010).

Student engagement researchers assert that there should be a shift to ground more of higher education practice in theory, research, models, and methodology developed on student development and student engagement (Harper & Quaye, 2015; Pomerantz, 2006; Strayhorn, 2012). For example, research-based practices for engaging international students include creating a welcoming atmosphere, building trust, getting to know students personally as individuals, providing advocacy, creating buddy programs, arranging social gatherings, and helping to connect international students to support programs and student services provided across campus (Ammigan & Jones, 2018; Cho & Yu, 2015; Lee, 2015; Shapiro, Farrelly, & Tomaš, 2014). However, research on international student satisfaction is normatively aimed at improving university support services for the explicit reason of increasing enrollment and retention of full-fare paying international students (see, for instance, Ammigan & Jones, 2018; Chan, 2016; Cho & Yu, 2015). Although these ideas and strategies may support students, these “best practices” still operate within a framework that serves to colonize students of color and advance the institutions’ financial interests (Harklau, 1999; Viggiano, López Damián, Morales Vázquez, Morales, & Levin, 2018)

However, more research is needed in order to inform the development of practices for supporting international students and other diverse student groups in higher education. The present study seeks to gain a more complex understanding of how faculty members’ beliefs align with colorblind ideology, and, in turn, how faculty conceptualize their role in creating inclusive and equitable learning environments for international students and other diverse student populations.

Accordingly, this research may provide a useful perspective to inform higher education practice. Ultimately, such research could help inform educational leaders of how to support faculty to foster more inclusive and affirming learning environments for international students of color and other diverse student populations. In addition, this research may help contribute to the work of decolonizing the standard academic policies, teaching practices, research methods, and institutional leadership frameworks that are deeply ingrained in U.S. higher education.

Theoretical Framework

The most common theoretical frameworks used in conceptualizing the issues faced by international students are “adaptation, adjustment, acculturation, and intercultural competence” (Lee, 2015, p. 112). These lenses place the onus on international students to adapt and assimilate in order to be successful. However, another key theoretical framework used in the literature is neo-racism, which argues that discrimination against international students is based on race as well as negative stereotypes connected with national origin (J. J. Lee & Rice, 2007; J. L. Lee, 2015). Moreover, neo-racism also asserts that national origin often functions as a proxy for racism or other forms of oppression (J. J. Lee & Rice, 2007; J. L. Lee, 2015). Accordingly, neo-racism implies that there are linkages between who is allowed to assimilate and country of origin and/or race. This is also the case for international students, who, as nonimmigrant visa holders, must assimilate temporarily in order to study in the United States.

Building on the theory of neo-racism, this study will utilize a theoretical framework of colorblind ideology and colorblind racism, two closely related ideas. The construct of colorblind ideology was conceptualized according to Neville et al. (2013) and Knowles et al. (2009), “with an emphasis on sameness, equal treatment for all, and the idea that all have equal opportunities”

(Aragón et al., 2017, p. 206). Colorblind ideology “arises historically from attempts to uphold American ideals of equality and fairness... in the fundamental interest to be fair to groups that are not in the majority” (Aragón et al., 2017, p. 202). However, research has demonstrated that colorblind ideology is used to maintain the status quo and to legitimize racial inequality in U.S. society by further entrenching existing inequalities (Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Choi, 2008; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Knowles et al., 2009; Markus et al., 2000; Plaut et al., 2009; Plaut et al., 2018). In particular, Critical Race Theory scholar Bonilla-Silva’s Colorblind Racism Frames will be used to help guide the literature review, the research methods, and the analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data in this study.

The theoretical framework for this study will provide an opportunity to filter and connect siloed knowledge about internationalization through the lens of Critical Race Theory. This is deeply needed because mainstream research on internationalization in U.S. higher education is typically not grounded in critical social theory and instead has been situated within a positivist framework where the responsibility for attending to positionality, relationality, and context in research is not acknowledged (see, for instance, Cao et al., 2014; Glass et al., 2015; Hung & Hyun, 2010; Wadsworth et al., 2008). Furthermore, the ethical issues related to this silence are compounded by the immense amount of race-neutral literature on the topic (see, for instance, Chan, 2016; Glass et al., 2015; Hung & Hyun, 2010; Kanno & Grosik, 2012; Marshall, 2010; Shapiro et al., 2014; Wadsworth et al., 2008).

History and Development of Critical Race Theory

Building upon the critical legal studies and radical feminism movements, Critical Race Theory developed in the 1970s when legal scholars and activists realized that “the heady advances of the civil rights era had stalled, and, in many respects, were being rolled back, [and

that] new theories and strategies were needed to combat the subtler forms of racism that were gaining ground” (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017, p. 4).

Two of the principal tenets of Critical Race Theory are *ordinariness* and *interest convergence*. The tenet of *ordinariness* asserts that racism is deeply ingrained in U.S. society as the usual way that society does business, and therefore, it is difficult to address. *Interest convergence* adds that the U.S. racial order of “white-over-color ascendancy serves important purposes, both psychic and material for the dominant group” (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017, p. 8). This system is maintained in part because colorblind ideology is used to legitimize the racial status quo. Specifically, Critical Race Theory scholars Delgado and Stefancic (2017) define color blindness as the “belief that one should treat all persons equally, without regard to their race” (p. 170), asserting that color blindness serves to maintain racism as the “ordinary business of society” (p. 27), including systemic, structural, and institutional forms of racism.

Likewise, Bonilla-Silva (2014) describes the evolution of racial ideology in the U.S. from overt forms of Jim Crow racism in the pre-civil rights era to covert and institutionalized forms of colorblind racism starting in the post-civil rights era beginning in the late 1960s:

Compared to Jim Crow racism, the ideology of color blindness seems like ‘racism lite.’ Instead of relying on name calling (niggers, spics, chinks), color-blind racism otherizes softly (‘these people are human, too’); instead of proclaiming that God placed minorities in the world in a servile position, it suggests they are behind because they do not work hard enough; instead of viewing interracial marriage as wrong on a straight racial basis, it regards it as ‘problematic’ because of concerns over the children, location, or the extra burden it places on couples. Yet this new ideology has become a formidable political tool for the maintenance of the racial order (p. 3).

Specifically, Bonilla-Silva (2014) argues that whites employ four overlapping frames in order to construct arguments to explain contemporary racial inequalities in U.S. society as the result of non-racial dynamics. Similarly, this ideology of colorblind racism shapes the context of U.S. higher education, and rationalizes the exclusion and differential treatment of students of color (Choi, 2008; Markus et al., 2000; McCoy et al., 2015; Plaut et al., 2009; Plaut et al., 2018).

Bonilla-Silva (2014) draws on data from two different studies to develop the colorblind racism frames. The first study was a qualitative study of white students' ideas about race conducted in 1997 with interviews of 41 white college students from three different universities. The second study, called the Detroit Area Study (DAS), was a survey study of 84 Detroit metropolitan area residents (66 identified as white and 17 identified as black) conducted in 1998. Both of these studies were limited by the demographics of the sample frames in terms of the age and the race of the participants. McCoy et al. (2015) provide the following concise clarifications of Bonilla-Silva's (2014) four Colorblind Racism Frames:

Abstract liberalism frame: The use of ideas related to political liberalism (related to notions of meritocracy and individualism) such as individual opportunity or choice to explain racism (e.g., students of color “choose” not to do well in graduate school or they are “not working hard enough”);

Naturalization frame: An explanation of racial inequality as something that might occur naturally (e.g., it is normal to have very few students of color in STEM classes);

Cultural racism frame: Culturally based arguments that explain racial inequality as something that has to do with culture (e.g., students of color are “less prepared”);

Minimization of racism frame: An explanation that discrimination is no longer a factor affecting people of color because things are better now than they were in the past (e.g., we do not need affirmative action anymore in graduate admissions) (p. 228).

Applications of Critical Race Theory to the Field of Education

While Critical Race Theory originally began in the field of law, it has since been applied to a wide range of disciplines including education, political science, women's studies, ethnic studies, American studies, sociology, theology, health care, and philosophy (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). Of particular relevance to this study is the application of Critical Race Theory to the field of education, where scholars such as Ladson-Billings (1999) and Gillborn (2008) have applied it as a critical lens to understand highly racialized policies and practices in schools. Examples include issues related to “school discipline and hierarchy, tracking, affirmative action, high-stakes testing, controversies over curriculum and history, bilingual and multicultural education, and alternative and charter schools” as well as the “deficit theory approach to schooling for minoritized kids” (Ladson-Billings, 1999, p. 7). Similarly, this study will also apply Critical Race Theory in the field of education, looking specifically at how faculty support international students of color in U.S. higher education.

While Critical Race Theory has been employed in research related to students of color in higher education, there is very limited research employing Critical Race Theory to understand international student engagement and internationalization. Accordingly, one goal of this study is to provide a model for applying this theory in the context of international student engagement in U.S. higher education. In particular, the theoretical framework in this study is similar to the theoretical framework used by McCoy et al., (2015), who applied Bourdieu's Social Reproduction Theory as well as Bonilla-Silva's Colorblind Racism Frames to guide their

research on the topic of white STEM faculty members' experiences with mentoring students of color.

Specifically, McCoy et al. (2015) asked the following research question: "How do white faculty in STEM disciplines at Atlantic State University (ASU), a PWI [predominantly white institution], and Mid-Atlantic State University (MASU), an HBCU [historically black college and university], describe their experiences in training/mentoring students, particularly students of color?" (p. 229). The research presented in the article was part of a larger case study project. Twenty faculty members participated in the larger study (ten at each institution), and were recruited using purposeful chain sampling in order to gain representation across academic departments. The article discussed here focused on a subset of eight white faculty because the initial analysis of the data showed that they often spoke of the Students of Color they engaged with in race-neutral (i.e., colorblind) language. The study utilized qualitative methods with analysis of data drawn from semi-structured interviews. White faculty were interviewed by white research assistants. The researchers combined an inductive (emerging from the data) and deductive (checking existing categories with the data) process in the analysis. The researchers developed a codebook to ensure consistent analysis across the research team. They also engaged in member checks, triangulation, peer debriefing, and negative case analysis. The researchers also discussed how they dealt with their own positionality in this research, modeling researcher reflexivity in their work.

Although this study applied Critical Race Theory to understand how white faculty navigate racialized dynamics and mentorship relationships with students of color in higher education, the research design omits the voices and perspectives of students of color. As a result, the perspectives of white faculty are centered in the research (rather than the students'

perspectives), which does not provide a complete investigation of the mentorship relationship, including, for example, how the students of color felt about their relationship with their white faculty mentor and their perceptions of how colorblind ideology influenced the relationship.

The study conducted as part of this dissertation also focuses on the experiences of faculty members. To provide a more complete picture, future research could investigate similar issues from the perspective of international students of color by utilizing interview or focus group methods to gather rich qualitative data about their experiences and their needs. Indeed, more research that centers the voices of students of color and the voices of international students of color is deeply needed, as it is normalized in higher education that as practitioners, we assume that we know what is best for the students rather than listening to the students and creating a space for them to express their needs.

Literature Review

The literature on internationalization of higher education can generally be divided into the following four categories: (a) institution-level comprehensive internationalization, (b) international enrollment management and international student recruitment, (c) internationalizing the curriculum and education abroad, and (d) international student engagement. Accordingly, these four categories frame the standard knowledge about internationalization in U.S. higher education. This literature review focuses on literature related to international student engagement and provides a critique of the typical lenses that are used to understand international student issues in higher education.

In particular, researchers in the field of international education frame the challenges that international students face in U.S. higher education as barriers related to second language learning, social isolation, cultural norms, costs and visa procedures, and discrimination (Glass et

al., 2015; Lee, 2015; Montgomery, 2010; Valdez, 2015; Yan & Pei, 2018). However, these framings are typically based on a deficit-theory approach and the implications of the research findings put the onus on international students to integrate and assimilate in order to address their problems. As a result, international students' issues are often understood as a form of maladaptation (Harklau, 1999; Lee, 2015).

This literature review examines a range of literature on international student engagement, using Critical Race Theory as a lens to critique the common assumptions underlying the ways that researchers have framed the challenges that international students face in U.S. higher education. As such, I have organized the literature review according to three themes, representing three abstract critiques of the literature: (a) colorblind ideology in research on international student engagement (b) deficit-theory in research on international student engagement, and (c) assimilation-framed research on international student engagement. Although some research in this review challenged one or two of these critiques (see, for example, Chan, 2016; Fries-Britt et al., 2014; Lee & Rice, 2007), none of the international student engagement research in this literature review challenged all three.

Colorblind Ideology in Research on International Student Engagement

Some of the literature on international student engagement utilizes culture, nationality, ethnicity, and language as lenses to understand international students (Chan, 2016; Kubota & Lin, 2006; J. Lee & Rice, 2007; E. Lee, 2007). These lenses are deeply problematic, considering how these categories are often used as a proxy for race, as Lee and Rice (2007) point out in their study of neo-racism and international students. As a result, international students are understood in terms of racialized categories, while discussions of race, racialization, and racism have been silenced. Specifically, international students are categorized in complex overlapping ways that

serve to mask racism and to reify whiteness. By utilizing these identity categories and avoiding discussion of race, many studies have perpetuated an ideology of colorblind racism; concealing structural forms of oppression in order to ensure that researchers and practitioners in higher education continue to be portrayed as innocent, non-racist, and inclusive (e.g., Glass et al., 2015; Hung & Hyun, 2010; Marshall, 2010; Shapiro et al., 2014; Wadsworth et al., 2008).

Although researchers have well documented that multilingual students of color experience discrimination based on culture, nationality, ethnicity, language, and religion (Bu, 2001; Holmes et al., 2012; Kanno & Grosik, 2012; Lee & Rice, 2007; Ng, 2007; Oropeza et al. 2010; Valdez, 2015; Yan & Pei, 2018), only a few (e.g., Chan, 2016; Harklau, 1999; Kubota & Lin, 2006; Lee & Rice, 2007; Lee, 2010) explicitly discuss how these racialized categories serve to camouflage the larger issue of racism. Moreover, these few studies are sometimes cited incorrectly in a way that inadvertently reinforces the encoding of race in proxies such as culture, language, and nationality. For instance, although Lee and Rice (2007) clearly describe how discrimination based on country of origin serves as a mask for racism, their research is cited by others in a way that reinforces country of origin as a proxy for race. Specifically, Glass et al. (2015) cite Lee and Rice (2007) in order to emphasize “country of origin as one of the most significant factors shaping international students’ experiences” (p. 95). However, Glass et al. (2015) deemphasize the significance of racism and mention it only briefly in connection with Africa as a “*country*” of origin, stating, “international students from Africa may find themselves the unwitting victims of America’s unresolved history of racial discrimination and ambivalence toward African Americans” (p. 96). This statement assumes a racially totalizing view of an entire continent, frames Africa as a country, and reifies nationality as a proxy for race. The authors go on to discuss the potential negative effects that discrimination could have on the number of

students who come from the “top-sending countries” (p. 97), implying that the students’ commercial value is the main reason to care about issues of discrimination against international students.

Deficit-theory in Research on International Student Engagement

Much of the literature (e.g., Ammigan & Jones, 2018; Cho & Yu, 2015; Hung & Hyun, 2010; Wadsworth et al., 2008) about international students in U.S. higher education pursues knowledge about how to help international students overcome their linguistic, cultural, and academic deficiencies in order to facilitate integration and acculturation. This kind of research reinforces a deeply ingrained deficit-frame surrounding international students in U.S. higher education. For example, Lee and Rice (2007) frame their discussion of international students by using language that is consistent with a deficit-view, describing many international students’ experiences as “issues,” “problems,” and “difficulties” that “greatly hinder social integration as well as their academic progress” (p. 386). Although Lee and Rice argue that some of the “challenges” that international students face are due to “inadequacies within the host society” (p. 381), the research still operates within a basic deficit frame.

Although deficit-framed research and discourse is still ubiquitous, research on internationalization in the last decade has begun to shift toward challenging the deficit view of international students (e.g., Chan, 2016; Fries-Britt et al., 2014; Glass et al., 2015; Harklau, 1999; Marshall, 2010; Montgomery, 2010; Oropeza et al. 2010; Shapiro, 2012; Valdez, 2015; Yan & Pei, 2018). However, much of the research simultaneously challenges and reinforces problematic ideologies in complex overlapping ways. For instance, Chan (2016) uses language that signals a clear deficit framing, defining the problem as “acculturative stress” due to issues with “language proficiency difficulties, cultural adaptation, homesickness, and perceived

discrimination” (p. 138). However, Chan (2016) also counters a deficit view by discussing overarching structural issues such as the role of gender, race, abilities, language and culture in U.S. society. Chan (2016) goes on to state that the goal of the research is “to increase student retention and recruitment” (pp. 139-140), linking the study to problematic discourse around marketization and integration.

While some researchers (e.g., Glass et al., 2015; Harklau, 1999; Lee, 2010; Marshall, 2010; Shapiro, 2012) acknowledge and explicitly name the deficit model applied to international students, they do not connect the deficit view of international students directly with structural and institutional racism in the context of U.S. higher education. Furthermore, much of the research (e.g., Ammigan & Jones, 2018; Holmes et al., 2012; Hung & Hyun, 2010; Kanno & Grosik, 2012; Wadsworth et al., 2008) continues to frame international student engagement as a problem of integration, renewing colonial notions of assimilation.

Assimilation-Framed Research on International Student Engagement

By framing the problem as integration and acculturation, researchers continue to reinforce a model of international student engagement that otherizes and colonizes international students of color (see, for instance, Ammigan & Jones, 2018; Cho & Yu, 2015; Glass, Kociolek, Lynch, Cong, 2015; Hung & Hyun, 2010; Lee, 2007; Marshall, 2010; Wadsworth et al., 2008). As a result, any knowledge constructed about international students’ process of integration and identity development is precarious because of how it reinforces the larger idea that international students of color are culturally deficient. Additionally, assimilation-framed research sets up a false binary between U.S. culture in contrast to other world cultures (e.g., individualist vs. collectivist cultures, Western vs. Eastern cultures, etc.). This way of thinking perpetuates problematic patterns of using ethnic reductionism, cultural stereotypes, and essentialism to

understand multilingual students of color, and ignores global migration patterns that complicate notions of any one country or region being monoracial or monocultural.

To take a case in point, Hung and Hyun's (2010) study is based on the premise that faculty, administrators, and staff at Western English-speaking institutions of higher education lack the intercultural training and knowledge of East Asian culture needed to help East Asian international graduate students with adapting and integrating to Western academic culture (pp. 340-341). Hung and Hyun (2010) argue that East Asian international students "may experience greater challenges in adjusting to the Western academic system than students from Western countries" because they are "influenced by Confucian tradition and collectivism, and they speak languages unrelated to Indo-European languages" (p. 341). By focusing on this frame, the researchers reinforce ethnic reductionism, stereotyping, and deficit discourse about international students.

In summary, this literature review has provided a critique of a range of literature on international student engagement, using Critical Race Theory as a lens to call into question the common assumptions underlying the ways that researchers have framed the challenges that international students face in U.S. higher education. As a result, this literature review identified three themes, representing three abstract critiques of the literature: (a) colorblind ideology in research on international student engagement (b) deficit-theory in research on international student engagement, and (c) assimilation-framed research on international student engagement.

Methodology

This study employed a convergent mixed methods design (Creswell, 2014) that involved separate collection of quantitative and qualitative data from a purposeful sample of participants consisting of university faculty members. The quantitative data as well as the demographic data

was gathered via a paper survey that participants completed upon arrival to their focus group meeting. After the participants completed the survey, they participated in a focus group that was audio recorded. The audio recordings from four focus groups were transcribed and coded to create the qualitative data set for this study. The quantitative and qualitative data sets were analyzed separately and then merged for analysis to provide a more complete picture.

The qualitative data helped to add depth, richness, and texture to the quantitative findings, and helped to determine to what extent the qualitative results confirmed the quantitative results. Moreover, the qualitative data provided an elucidation of the ways in which the constructs measured in the survey show up, emerge, and are enacted by the participants. Specifically, the survey measured how the participants' beliefs and teaching practices aligned with the constructs of colorblind ideology and multicultural ideology. The authors of the survey instrument employed in this study state that the construct of colorblind ideology was conceptualized according to Neville, et al. (2013) and Knowles et al. (2009), "with an emphasis on sameness, equal treatment for all, and the idea that all have equal opportunities" (Aragón, Dovidio, and Graham, 2017, p. 206). Similarly, Aragón et al. (2017) conceptualized the construct of multicultural ideology in the survey according to Knowles et al., (2009) as an ideology that "acknowledges, embraces, and makes accommodations to be inclusive of differences. Multiculturalism takes into account that all people are not the same, and equal treatment may not be beneficial for all" (p. 202).

Measuring the alignment of faculty members' beliefs with the construct of colorblind ideology helped to interpret the qualitative data set in order to better understand some of the ways in which colorblind ideology may function to maintain racialized dynamics in U.S. higher education, especially in the context of supporting international students of color. However, the

survey alone did not provide data that specifically linked the construct of colorblind ideology to this topic. Therefore, a mixed methods design was employed. The qualitative data helped to provide a more complex understanding of these constructs in relation to how faculty conceptualize and actualize their role in creating an inclusive campus for international students and other diverse student groups.

By applying the measurement of colorblind ideology in the context of internationalization of U.S. higher education, one goal of this study was to provide a different angle to understanding international student engagement. By extension, this study may serve as a useful model for applying Critical Race Theory in research related to engaging international students and other diverse student groups in U.S. higher education. Accordingly, this mixed methods study explored one quantitative research question and five qualitative research questions:

1. How do faculty members' beliefs about inclusive teaching practices align with the constructs of colorblind ideology and multicultural ideology? (quantitative)
2. How do faculty members define who counts as an international student?
3. What are faculty members' beliefs about making special efforts to be supportive of international students, and how do they do this in practice?
4. How do faculty members conceptualize their role in creating an inclusive campus for international students and for other populations of diverse students?
5. How do faculty members conceptualize the role of leadership in creating an inclusive campus for international students and for other populations of diverse students?
6. How do colorblind and multicultural ideologies show up in the discourse related to inclusive teaching practices and supporting diverse student populations?

Sampling and Participant Demographics

This study employed purposive sampling to identify 27 faculty members at a public four-year university in the Pacific Northwest of the United States. This purposive sample allowed for in-depth study of the beliefs and teaching practices of these faculty members in relation to how they conceptualized and actualized their role in supporting international students. Accordingly, the sample helped to provide an understanding of these issues in the context of the specific institution, and by extension, in the context of other similar institutions. As a result, the findings of this study may help to inform the approaches of educational leaders and faculty members who work with international students and other diverse student groups in similar contexts.

Participants were university faculty recruited via email. An administrator at the institution sent an email to all university faculty on behalf of the researcher, and in follow up, the researcher sent individual personalized emails via mail chimp to invite every faculty member at the institution to participate in the study. The sampling frame was comprehensive based on the email list of all faculty at the institution, including tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty. A total of 458 faculty were emailed via mail chimp. Ten of the 458 emails bounced, meaning that the message could not be delivered to ten email addresses for some reason. 300 (67%) faculty opened the email. 53 (11.8%) faculty clicked on the link to view more information about the study. 30 faculty signed up for focus groups, three of whom later dropped out. In total, 27 faculty participated in four focus groups of various sizes (7, 3, 11, and 6, respectively).

Academic disciplines. The attribute analysis of the demographic data showed that the participants represented a wide range of academic disciplines at the institution. Specifically, 15 of the 27 participants were faculty of the School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (SIAS), which included seven faculty from the Sciences and Mathematics division, three faculty from the Culture, Arts, and Communication division, three faculty from the Social, Behavioral and

Human Sciences division, and two faculty from the Politics, Philosophy, and Public Affairs division. In addition, three of the 27 participants were faculty of the School of Engineering and Technology (SET), three participants were faculty of the School of Education (SOE), three participants were faculty of the School of Business (SOB), two were faculty of Nursing and Healthcare Leadership, and one participant was an Urban Studies faculty member.

Additionally, 19 (70.4%) of the 27 indicated that they primarily teach undergraduate students, three (11.1%) teach primarily graduate students, and five (18.5%) teach both undergraduate and graduate students. Additionally, the participants were asked to estimate the highest percentage of international student enrollment in any one of their courses. The School of Engineering (57%) and the School Business (47%) faculty reported having classes with the highest percentages of international student enrollment. Faculty members from Education, Urban Studies, and Nursing reported having the lowest percentages of international student enrollment.

Table 1

Estimated Highest % of International Student Enrollment

School, Division, Program	%
SIAS	18%
SOE	5%
SOB	47%
SET	57%
NHL	10%
US	5%

Tenure, position, years teaching, and age. The study sample included a range of faculty in terms of tenure, number of years teaching, and age. On average, the participants had 6.3 years of teaching experience at the current university and 15.7 years of teaching experience overall. Participants were 47 years old on average. 14 (51.9%) of 27 were non tenure-track, six (22.2%) were tenure-track, and seven (25.9%) were tenured. This information is summarized in the table below.

Table 2

Tenure Status, Position, Years Teaching, and Age

Tenure Status and Position	<i>n</i>	Avg. Years Teaching at Current Univ.	Avg. Years Teaching Overall	Avg. Age
Non Tenure-track	14	6.1	15.4	51
Lecturer	8	2.3	13.2	51.4
Professor of Practice	1	1.5	3.5	60
Senior Lecturer	5	13.2	21.4	48.6
Tenure-track	6	3	8.67	35.5
Assistant Professor	6	3	8.67	35.5
Tenured	7	9.4	22.1	49.8
Assistant Professor	1	2	6	33
Associate Professor	4	8.5	17.75	49.5
Full Professor	2	15	19	68
Total	27	6.3	15.7	47.2

Country of origin, race, gender, and experience as an international student. The survey included questions about the participants' country of origin, race, and experience as an international student, which was necessary to allow for demographic analysis. By combining the country of origin data with the race data, two key groups emerged within the set of 27 participants: (a) white U.S. faculty and (b) international faculty of color (i.e. participants of color who identified as having countries of origin other than the U.S.). As this study employs Critical Race Theory to guide the literature review, methods, and data analysis, it follows then that a comparison of these two groups may provide important insights into the study's research questions.

Amongst the 27 participants, 14 (51.9%) indicated that the United States was their country of origin. 12 (44.4%) participants indicated other countries of origin, and one participant (3.7%) did not disclose her country of origin, but noted that she was not born in the U.S. 15 (55.6%) of the 27 participants indicated female as their gender preference, and 12 (44.4%) indicated male as their gender preference.

Twelve (44.5%) of the 27 participants self-identified as white. All of the white participants indicated that the United States was their country of origin. Six (50%) of the 12 white participants indicated that they had never been an international student before. The other six indicated that they studied abroad in England, France, Germany, or New Zealand for periods of time ranging from six weeks to one year. Five of the 12 white participants indicated male as their gender, and seven indicated female as their gender preference. The average age of the white participants was 49 years old. Three of the white participants were tenured faculty, two were tenure-track, and seven were non-tenure track.

Thirteen (48.1%) of the 27 participants self-identified as races other than white, or as mixed race. For the purposes of discussing the demographic analysis in this study, the participants in this subset of 13 faculty will be referred to as participants of color. Two of the 13 participants of color indicated that the United States was their country of origin, and 11 of the 13 participants of color indicated having other countries of origin. The two participants of color whose country of origin was the U.S. indicated that they had never been an international student before. The 11 participants of color with other countries of origin indicated that they all had experiences as international students for periods of two to ten years with an average of seven years of experience as an international student. Nine of the 11 international participants of color indicated that they were international students in the United States, one studied in England, and one did not disclose where he studied as an international student. Six of the 13 participants of color indicated male as their gender preference, and seven indicated female as their gender preference. The average age of the participants of color was 45 years old. Four of the participants of color were tenured faculty, four were tenure-track, and five were non tenure-track.

Two (7.4%) of the 27 participants did not disclose their race. One of these two participants also did not disclose their country of origin, and one indicated the USSR as the country of origin. The self-identified races of participants are summarized in Table 3.

Protection of Human Subjects

The research activities in this study presented no more than minimal risk to human subjects. The study used demographic analysis techniques and disaggregation to capture the perspectives of international faculty of color while taking care not to disaggregate the data in any way that could potentially compromise the anonymity of the participants. Accordingly, there was

no more than minimal risk related to breach of confidentiality or invasion of privacy. Moreover, the name of the institution is not used in the study, and will be kept confidential.

Table 3

Races of Participants

Race	<i>n</i>	%
No response	2	7.4%
Asian	6	22.2%
Hispanic	1	3.7%
Indian	3	11.1%
Latino	1	3.7%
Mixed race	2	7.4%
White	12	44.5%
Total	27	100%

Data Collection

Quantitative data. Participants took the *Colorblind and Multicultural Ideology of STEM Faculty Measure* (See Appendix A), which was developed by Aragón, Dovidio, and Graham (2017). The survey was developed to gather self-reported quantitative data in regard to STEM faculty members' beliefs about teaching practices in order to measure the alignment of participants' beliefs with the constructs of colorblind ideology and multicultural ideology.

Aragón et al. (2017) utilized this four-question survey as part of a study measuring college-level science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) educators' process of adopting inclusive teaching practices. The purpose of their study was to test “a model of the process by which educators adopt such practices, and the relationship between adoption and two ideologies of diversity” (Aragón et al., 2017, p. 201). The findings indicated that “pathway modeling revealed reliable, discrete steps in the process of adoption” and that “greater endorsement of colorblindness predicted adoption of fewer inclusive teaching practices, and multiculturalism predicted adoption of more practices” (Aragón et al., 2017, p. 201). The researchers argue that “these findings inform national-level intervention efforts about the process by which educators adopt inclusive teaching practices, and suggest that interventions might consider educators' personal beliefs and approaches to diversity” (Aragón et al., 2017, p. 201).

The present study extends the work of Aragón et al. (2017) by broadening the sample frame to include faculty of any academic discipline. In addition, this study connects the quantitative ideology scores with rich qualitative data capturing how faculty conceptualize and actualize their role in supporting international students and other diverse student groups. Additionally, this study includes a demographic analysis of the data, taking care not to disaggregate the data in a way that would potentially compromise the confidentiality of the research participants.

In order to ensure that the language of the survey was inclusive of all academic disciplines, I replaced the word “science” with “my academic discipline” in Q1 of the *Colorblind and Multicultural Ideology of STEM Faculty Measure* (See Appendix A). All other questions on the survey did not need any modification, so it is reasonable to assume that the construct validity of the survey was preserved. In addition, a second section containing fourteen demographic

questions was created and attached to the survey to allow for demographic analysis of the data. In total, the entire survey includes eighteen questions.

After taking the paper survey, participants engaged in a focus group, in which the qualitative data set for this study was generated. Only faculty who attended the focus group session took the survey, and it was completed at the time of arrival for the focus group. A numbering system was employed in order to closely link the participants' survey responses with their focus-group responses for purposes of data analysis.

Linking each individual's responses on the survey to their responses from the focus groups allowed for more ways to analyze the qualitative and quantitative data by subsets. For example, the demographic data was used to compare the responses of distinct participant groups. This included a comparison of qualitative and quantitative responses from white U.S. faculty and international faculty of color. Similarly, the linking allowed for a comparison of qualitative data for participants whose quantitative responses indicated that their beliefs align most closely with colorblind ideology and participants' whose beliefs aligned most closely with multicultural ideology. As a result of linking the quantitative and qualitative data sets in this way, it was possible to analyze the relationships between them in a variety of ways that helped to provide a deeper, more complex understanding.

Qualitative data. The focus groups employed in this study followed the standardized open-interview method, which uses "predeveloped questions that the interviewer asks throughout the interview. Each participant is exposed to the same topics and questions in the same order" (Martella, Nelson, Morgan, Marchand-Martella, 2013, p. 332). The interview protocol for the focus groups included nine open-ended questions, which focus on two of the six types of interview questions developed by Patton (as cited in Martella et al., 2013, p. 333), namely

experience/behavior (See Appendix B: Q1, Q2, & Q4) and opinion/values (See Appendix B: Q3, Q5, & Q6). Focus group interviews were audio recorded, transcribed, and coded following the analysis framework for first-cycle concept coding and second-cycle focused coding as described by Saldaña (2016). The first-cycle concept coding refers to the initial coding of the data, which involved identifying concepts that emerged from the data. The second-cycle focused coding refers to the process of classifying, synthesizing, and abstracting the first-cycle concepts into categories. The analysis of the focus group data included themes related to colorblind ideology and multicultural ideology. In addition, Bonilla-Silva's (2014) colorblind racism frames were utilized to interpret the findings in order to consider if there were any tacit references to race or racialized dynamics. Coding of the data was conducted using Quirkos, a qualitative data analysis software package.

Data Analysis

I first typed up the field notes I jotted down while moderating the four focus groups to capture impressions, body language, emotions, tones, and other elements of observed interactions. The audio from the four focus group sessions was transcribed by a professional transcription service (Rev.com). After receiving each transcription, a summary of the discussion items, topics, and key quotes was created for each focus group session. The transcriptions were then divided into individual MS Word documents for each participant. Member checks were then conducted to ensure the accuracy of the transcription. The verified MS Word documents were then uploaded as individual sources into Quirkos, a CAQDAS qualitative software package. Entering each participant as a unique source in Quirkos allowed for attribute coding of each participant's quantitative scores, demographic information, and other survey responses. In this way, each participant's focus group transcription was linked to their quantitative survey

responses. By organizing the qualitative data in this way, it was possible to run reports that sorted and displayed the qualitative data by participants' attributes. For example, it was possible to easily compare coded qualitative data by attributes such as gender, race, tenure, etc.

The first cycle of coding employed Quirkos and followed Saldaña's (2016) process of concept coding. The concept codes were created following an inductive process (emerging from the data). As new concepts emerged a new code was created. The data was coded with multiple overlapping codes when multiple concepts were referenced in a single quote. The second cycle of coding also employed Quirkos and followed Saldaña's (2016) process of focused coding, which involves sorting related concepts into categories. This process helped to organize the data in terms of relevance to the study's research questions and to begin suggesting some potential emerging themes. Specifically, the CAQDAS graphics in Quirkos were utilized to organize the codes and to identify those that stood out as the most prominent in terms of the number of codes. The CAQDAS graphics also provided a clear way of identifying the participants whose comments were most frequently linked with each code.

This process helped to clarify the magnitude of the codes. The data was then exported to Excel where pivot tables were used to disaggregate the coded qualitative data by attributes such as quantitative scores and demographic factors. This process was used to triangulate the data as well as to identify salient similarities among and differences between demographic groups in terms of the issues that were discussed. In light of the disaggregated data, it was determined that there were some distinct demographic groups that stood out as significant to this study because of the variance in the types of responses given. Therefore, the focused codes were reexamined to identify the most relevant themes in relation to the research questions. The second-cycle focused codes were then abstracted further into a set of six themes with two or three subthemes each.

Mixed-methods analysis. The separate quantitative data set from the survey consists of colorblind and multicultural ideology scores as well as demographic data, and the qualitative data set consists of the coded focus-group data. These two data sets were analyzed separately and then merged according to the process described by Creswell (2014, pp. 36-37). Creswell's (2014) process involves first reviewing interpretations and inferences drawn from each data set separately. Then, these interpretations are brought together in a discussion where the results are arrayed together to determine to what extent the quantitative results were confirmed by the qualitative results. Specifically, the quantitative data was analyzed first, and then the focus group data was analyzed by themes. Both data sets were then arrayed together to consider the relationship between the quantitative and qualitative data to allow for a more complex understanding of the results.

Justification of Methods

In addition to extending the work of Aragón et al. (2017), the methods for this study build on the work of researchers who have examined internationalization of higher education from the perspective of faculty members (see, for instance, Cao, Li, Jiang, & Bai, 2014; Haan et al., 2017; Trice, 2003; Trice, 2007). Specifically, the convergent mixed methods design of this study provided an enhanced understanding of the relationship between faculty beliefs and teaching practices by capturing rich, in-depth qualitative data and merging it with a quantitative data set. In addition, this study's guiding theoretical framework of Critical Race Theory provides a distinct perspective on international student engagement, which is typically researched and understood through other lenses.

The methods of this study are somewhat similar to those of a study by Haan et al. (2017), who examined what higher education faculty members believe about internationalization,

instructional practices for working with multilingual students, and what faculty believe about their own self-efficacy in teaching multilingual students. Haan et al. (2017) were guided by a theoretical framework of language teacher cognition and self-efficacy to examine the relationship between faculty beliefs and teaching practices in a context of transformative internationalization of higher education in the United States. The researchers developed an online survey of faculty beliefs and practices for working with international students. The survey consisted of twelve Likert-type questions with optional open-ended comments sections, creating a survey that collected both quantitative and qualitative data. The survey was administered to over 500 full-time and adjunct faculty members online over a period of three weeks in May 2013. In total, 92 faculty responded to the survey constituting a 39% response rate. All of the faculty surveyed were from the same university. In their analysis of the data, the Likert-questions on the survey were aggregated for all respondents and averaged and reported in percentages. The qualitative data was grouped by survey question and coded for the emergent themes relevant to the research question topics: internationalization, instruction, and self-efficacy. This study provided a more aggregate analysis of the data, which has many limitations. For example, the aggregate analysis employed by Haan et al. (2017) obscured the unique experiences and perspectives of faculty of color, female faculty, and faculty who self-identify as members of other minoritized groups.

Haan, et al. (2017) found that there was “a theory-reality split in beliefs about internationalization and techniques for teaching international students along with relatively low levels of self-efficacy in working with emergent multilinguals” (p. 37). Specifically, the researchers found that the results “clearly indicate a split between valuing an internationalized student body in theory and doing so in practice when faced with the challenge of teaching

culturally and linguistically diverse classes” (p. 46). Further research that obtains richer qualitative data is needed in order to drill down deeper to understand this theory-reality split.

The current study helps to add to this knowledge base while differentiating itself from Haan et al. (2017) by adding more nuance through the qualitative data and mixed methods analysis. By using a convergent mixed methods design with Critical Race Theory as a guiding framework, this study provides new interpretations and inferences to understand faculty beliefs and teaching practices in regard to supporting international students and other diverse groups of students.

Trustworthiness of the Data

To establish trustworthiness and rigor in the research process, I engaged in member checks, triangulation of methods and triangulation of sources, as well as peer debriefing with the dissertation chair and committee members (Martella et al., 2013). Specifically, member checks were conducted by sending each participant a transcription of their comments during the focus groups as well as their responses to the survey in order to ensure that their comments and survey responses were accurately represented. By having the related quantitative data and qualitative data sets, this also allowed for triangulation of the data in terms of methods. An additional level of triangulation of sources was achieved through comparing data from the participants in four different focus group sessions, each of which consisted of entirely unique participants. Moreover, the methodology and findings of this dissertation have undergone a thorough peer review process by the dissertation chair as well as the dissertation committee members to ensure that the researcher has maintained a high level of rigor throughout the research process.

Positionality of the Researcher

The research in this study was conducted as part of a dissertation for the Ed.D. program in Educational Leadership at the University of Washington Tacoma. I moderated focus groups at a public four-year institution where I did not know the participants and did not have any formal relationship with the participants. However, one of the non tenure-track participants in the study had previously taught a class as a lecturer in the Ed.D. program at UW Tacoma where I am a student. This relationship did not appear to have any effect on the way that the participant responded in the focus group. In terms of my style of moderating, I paid careful attention to adhere to a preset list of questions, and I strived to foster a space where the participants could have a natural conversation without much overt directing of the discussion on my part. Accordingly, I believe that my presence appeared very neutral to the participants.

As this study employs Critical Race Theory as the guiding theoretical framework, it was important for me to continually attend to my own positionality, beliefs, and biases in this work. Over the past eleven years, I have worked in teaching and administration as part of an international student office at a private four-year university in the U.S. Through my experience as a part of this community, I have come into consciousness about racism, neo-racism, and other systems of oppression. At the same time, I have come to recognize that I have benefitted greatly from white male privilege in my own life experience and that I would never have reached this point in life if it were not for all of the people supporting me and lifting me up along the way. I believe a lot of the support that I have received from educators since elementary school was due to the fact that I am a white male. In contrast to my life experience, I have seen family members, friends, coworkers, mentors, and students treated unjustly because of the intersectionality of their race, accent, country of origin, gender, social class, and/or sexual orientation. In particular, I am

grateful for the international students of color and international faculty of color who have helped me to understand their experiences through sharing stories of their experiences with me.

In addition, my experiences engaging with international communities of color has helped me to gain cognizance and empathy for multiple perspectives, and it has helped me to recast my life experiences in a context of white male privilege. For instance, I have come into consciousness about the ways in which my experiences of studying abroad for a semester and teaching abroad for a year were shaped by privilege, and I know the ways in which my experiences cannot be compared to the experiences of international students of color in U.S. higher education. Accordingly, I have come to a point where I understand the important responsibility of maintaining my humility in order to locate myself in relation to students of color from a place of integrity.

As a researcher, I aspire to develop a research agenda rooted in critical theory that is centered on issues related to internationalization of higher education with a specific focus on supporting the success of international students of color and international educators of color. During the process of collecting and analyzing the data, I had to work through potential biases that came up when the participants made comments that went against my grain as an advocate of international students of color. For instance, participants made colorblind statements suggesting that race, culture, and other identity factors do not matter and should not matter. I dealt with this by reserving judgment and approaching the data analysis with an open mind to consider these comments from a place that assumes a positive and supportive intent of the participant in regard to showing fairness to all students. In addition, peer debriefing provided an opportunity to help work through any potential biases on my part in the data analysis. In this way, I was able to ensure a balanced approach that took into consideration the big picture.

Limitations

The data sets in this study were drawn from 27 faculty members at one public four-year institution in the Pacific Northwest. As a result, the focus of this study is on validity and impact at the institution where the study was conducted and at other similar institutions. One example of how the context of a single institution influenced the study was how the focus group discussions sometimes shifted to other concerns about the institution that were not directly relevant to the study. Additionally, another limitation was that only one researcher was involved in coding the data in order to maintain the confidentiality of the participants. For this reason, the peer debriefing process with the dissertation chair and committee members was used to ensure rigor in the methodology, analysis, and findings.

One other limitation of this study is that the research only includes the perspectives of faculty members. More research is needed that centers the voices and experiences of international students in order to provide a more complete picture. However, one potentially mitigating factor in this study is that nine of the participants indicated that they were international students for an average of seven years in the U.S., having studied at the undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral levels in the U.S.

Results

Quantitative Results

Faculty participants in this study completed a paper survey (a modified version of the Colorblind and Multicultural Ideology of STEM Faculty Measure) at the time of arrival for the focus group. This survey instrument was employed because previous research has shown that greater endorsement of multicultural ideology may predict adoption of more inclusive teaching practices, and that greater endorsement of colorblind ideology may predict adoption of fewer

inclusive teaching practices (Aragón et al., 2017). For example, one study has shown that the use of colorblind language in the classroom can generate distrust for women and people of color due to the contrast with the reality of racialized and gendered dynamics that are present (Aragón et al., 2017). However, in studies of white research participants, it was found that colorblind ideology and multicultural ideology were positively correlated (Levin et al., 2012; Ryan, Hunt, Weible, Peterson, & Casas, 2007). Perhaps this correlation is partially attributable to both concepts being based on the idea of fairness to groups that are not in the majority.

A numbering system was employed in order to link the participants' survey responses with their focus-group responses for purposes of data analysis. The Colorblind and Multicultural Ideology of STEM Faculty Measure contains four items rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = disagree slightly, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = agree slightly, 6 = agree, and 7 = agree strongly). These items measure faculty members' endorsement of colorblind ideology and multicultural ideology. Questions one and two below were used to measure the participants' endorsement of colorblind ideology, while questions three and four were used to measure the participants' endorsement of multicultural ideology:

Q1: I believe in treating every student equally as a person who has an equal opportunity to be outstanding in my academic discipline.

Q2: I believe that in an inclusive classroom educators should focus on what makes students the same and not focus on what makes students different (e.g., race and gender).

Q3: I believe that we should make special efforts to be supportive of underrepresented students (i.e., female students and/or students of color).

Q4: I believe that an inclusive classroom is achieved when we embrace the qualities that make us different.

By averaging the scores from the two items in each section, a combined mean score was calculated for each factor (colorblind ideology and multicultural ideology) for each participant. The mean scores for the two factors were utilized to determine who agreed, disagreed, and was neutral. Specifically, $\bar{x} < 4 = \text{disagree}$; $4 \leq \bar{x} < 5 = \text{neutral}$; $\bar{x} \geq 5 = \text{agree}$. The results showed that 19 of 27 (70%) participants agreed with colorblind ideology, four neither agreed nor disagreed with colorblind ideology, and four disagreed with colorblind ideology. Moreover, 24 of 27 (88.9%) agreed with multicultural ideology, one neither agreed nor disagreed with multicultural ideology, and two disagreed with multicultural ideology. Overall, in this study, the majority of participants agreed with both factors with 18 of 27 (66.7%) endorsing both ideologies. This relationship is arrayed in the Punnett square below.

Table 4

Participants' Endorsement of Multicultural and Colorblind Ideology Factors

		Multicultural Ideology		
		Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Colorblind Ideology	Disagree	2	0	2
	Neutral	0	0	4
	Agree	0	1	18

In order to gain a more complex understanding of the meaning of the strong endorsement of both multicultural ideology and colorblind ideology in this study, the qualitative focus group data was analyzed by themes to understand how the intersection of these ideologies manifested in participants' beliefs and teaching practices for working with specific student populations who

may benefit from customized educational supports. In particular, this study focused on international students as one such population.

Qualitative Results

The focus groups lasted about 70 minutes and were conducted in a natural conversational format where not every participant had to answer every question and anyone could jump in to answer a question. All four focus groups generated very engaging and lively discussion. However, the conversational focus group format had some limitations. For example, some participants spoke more than others, and some participants may have felt inhibited due to the risk of sharing their beliefs about instructional practices and their opinions of the university's leadership in front of their peers. See Appendix C for the summary notes from each individual focus group.

Key themes and subthemes. By using demographic attribute coding of the survey responses from each participant who took part in the focus groups, two key groups emerged within the set of 27 participants: (a) white U.S. faculty and (b) international faculty of color (i.e. participants of color who identified as having countries of origin other than the U.S.). As this study employs Critical Race Theory to guide the literature review, methods, and data analysis, it follows then that a comparison of these two groups may provide important insights into the study's research questions. In the data analysis, both groups expressed many similar overlapping ideas in regard to their beliefs and teaching practices, but there were also potentially significant distinctions that emerged. Accordingly, these two demographic groups were used for comparison whenever salient differences enhanced the analysis of the theme or subtheme. The data analysis resulted in six emergent themes with two or three subthemes each: (a) A Problematic Underlying Context: Who Counts as an International Student?; (b) Colorblind Beliefs and Teaching

Practices; (c) Multicultural Beliefs and Teaching Practices; (d) Overlap of Colorblind and Multicultural Beliefs and Teaching Practices; (e) The Role of Faculty in Creating an Inclusive Campus; (f) The Role of Leadership in Creating an Inclusive Campus

Theme 1: A problematic underlying context: who counts as an international student? The four focus group conversations started with the faculty participants asking how “international student” was being defined for this study. It is likely that the survey may have had a priming effect that led participants to have this question in mind at the start of the focus groups. However, one purpose of the study was to understand how faculty members define this student category. In turn, the moderator posed the question back to the faculty participants to ask them who they believe counts as an international student. The participants discussed that although officially international students are individuals in the U.S. on F-1 student visas or J-1 exchange visitor visas, faculty teaching undergraduate courses do not have access to this information. Some faculty who teach in master’s degree or doctoral degree programs said that they do have access to this information because they are involved in admitting the students to their respective graduate degree programs. In the absence of specific information regarding students’ visa status, faculty relied on other types of perceived indicators of international status.

Profiling students and implicit bias. The majority of the participants in the study expressed that they tend to rely on “profiling” students and making assumptions. The participants explained that this is due to not having access to this information and due to the belief that it would be inappropriate to ask a student about their visa status. In all four of the focus groups, the faculty agreed that there is usually no way to know for sure that a student is an international student unless the student self-discloses their status to the faculty member. For instance, some participants noted that sometimes a student will disclose this information when travel or visa

issues have an impact on a student's ability to attend classes or to complete an assignment, or when sharing a personal story in class, one-on-one with the professor, or in a writing assignment. The faculty all agreed that they do not ask students about this kind of personal information because they believe that it would be inappropriate to ask. However, in the absence of having this information, the faculty in this study talked about relying on "profiling" students as in the following quote:

I can't really ask which students are here on a student visa and get a legal form of confirmation. It wouldn't be appropriate to go ask the university, so I would say that, for my part, I look for cues. I'm sure there's unconscious biases that creep in, so I can look at a language barrier so I can identify if a student doesn't feel like they have the skills, either speaking or writing English. That's fraught with problems. They may write and speak better than they realize. Then also, racial background, if I'm being honest, and I try not to. But, undoubtedly, that's in the back of my thinking is just to look at a student who maybe speaks with an accent, has a different racial background than a lot of the other students in the course or than myself to be honest. As much as I'd like to not rely on those cues, in the absence of more definite information on who is an international student, that's what I end up doing.

When the faculty participants admitted to "profiling" international students, they framed their behavior as the result of individual implicit biases that could be addressed on an individual level. However, the research on racial profiling in the field of education has shown that racial profiling is a norm in the U.S. education system, and as a result, racial profiling has become an institutionalized practice that forms an overarching structural barrier for students of color (Akom, 2001; Iverson & Jagers, 2015). Specifically, scholars assert that the basic tenets of

racial profiling are surveillance, deficit-thinking, comparative racialization, and stereotyping (Iverson & Jagers, 2015).

Additionally, this finding is also closely linked to the concept of stereotype threat. Steele (2010) coined the term stereotype threat to refer to situations in which people feel at risk of confirming negative stereotypes about their race, gender, nationality, group, etc. Specifically, Steele's (2010) research found that, in educational situations where stereotype threat was present, individuals experienced a significant negative impact on academic achievement and performance. In a context where professors admit to profiling students, international students' identity factors including nationality, race, and language all become salient factors in the classroom context, and international students may feel at risk of behaving in a way that may confirm negative stereotypes about them based on these or other identity factors. In turn, this may affect the students' academic performance or achievement. More research is needed to understand the nuances of how racial profiling and stereotype threat function as structural barriers for international students and how international students of color navigate these forms of institutional racism.

“Foreigners” and assimilation. The participants' comments also indicated that their profile of an international student is any student of color who speaks English with an accent, or anyone a faculty member perceives to be a “foreigner”. As a result, the question of who counts as an international student became a kind of proxy for a discussion of which students count as foreigners. For this reason, the participants linked the definition of international student with a perceived level of assimilation and acculturation in relation to U.S. culture and the U.S. university system. Another factor that the participants used to define international students was the perceived level of confidence with speaking and writing in English (presumably as a second

language) in a way that is comfortable for both the international student and his/her interlocutors, which includes other students and faculty, many of whom are presumably native speakers of English.

In other words, if a professor perceives that a student of color has an accent or seems unfamiliar with some aspect of U.S. culture, the professor may profile the student as “foreign”, and therefore the professor may make an assumption that this student is an international student. For instance, some faculty mentioned that lack of familiarity with U.S. cultural norms, idioms, or certain vocabulary stand out as “cues” to the faculty member that a person is an international student. This type of profiling behavior creates an environment of comparative racialization that centers on whiteness, and research has shown that such classroom dynamics can have a silencing effect on international students of color, positioning them as a backdrop or audience, especially in classroom settings dominated by white students (DiAngelo, 2006). One faculty member stated that he considers students who are recent immigrants (not on a student visa) to be “on the margin of international but not quite”. Another faculty member made similar comments in regard to some students being “less of an international student” if they have been in the U.S. for a couple years and they have an understanding of U.S. educational culture.

In addition to the perceived level of assimilation in terms of language and culture, the faculty also linked the concept of being an international student with being a person of color whose family immigrated to the U.S. For instance, one participant stated that when he says “foreigners”, he also includes “the second generation”, meaning any children of immigrants are also included in his definition of an international student. Furthermore, the participants also brought up the concept of DACA students in the context of this discussion. Along the same lines,

a U.S. faculty member of color reflected on how looking back, he believes that he may have been perceived to be an international student by his professors when he was a student:

I've been schooled in the U.S. from kindergarten, but I'm the first one in my family to go to college and actually one of only a few people in my family that graduated high school. I think for many instructors and professors, I lacked the types of academic literacies that would have necessarily identified me as a native student. I was lost for my first two years of college and I needed a lot of support. I dropped out three times because I just didn't know how to navigate the system. It took me a while to understand what it meant to be in college, how to study, how to gain help and access. I wonder if maybe some of my instructors or professors thought that I was an international student even though I'd been schooled in the U.S. from the get-go.

This finding that professors do not make any distinction based on non-immigrant or immigrant status connects the experience of international students of color with those of immigrants of color who are also perceived as simply “foreigners”. It follows then that our understanding of international student engagement may be enhanced by repositioning the conversation within a broader context and history of immigration, assimilation, Americanization, and settler colonialism in the United States. For example, Au, Brown, and Calderón (2016) describe how the foundations of education and curriculum in the Pacific Northwest have been shaped by colonial legacies and trajectories related to the “problem” of Chinese-American and Japanese-American education in the early 20th century and the history of “yellow peril” (p. 50). This additional context is helpful when examining academic policies and teaching practices for working with international students and what those policies and practices mean in light of the ways that U.S. institutions have excluded immigrant communities of color historically.

Moreover, situating the institutionalized racial profiling behaviors, implicit biases, and stereotypes within the historical context of the treatment of immigrant communities of color in the U.S. helps to make visible that these are all manifestations of colonial trajectories that have become deeply institutionalized and are still evident in the U.S. education system today.

Faculty members' white fragility. At times during the focus groups, the conversation appeared to create some stress and discomfort for some of the white faculty members that triggered some defensive moves such as displays of emotion, argumentation, denial, silence and closed body language. The defensive moves observed in the focus groups are consistent with the concept of white fragility, “a state in which even a minimum amount of racial stress becomes intolerable, triggering a range of defensive moves....These behaviors, in turn, function to reinstate white racial equilibrium” (DiAngelo, 2011, p. 57).

Indeed, for the white faculty, there was an added layer of concern with appearing non-racist and non-biased both in their classroom teaching practices as well as amongst their peers in the focus group itself. For example, dynamics of white fragility were evident when white faculty responded after international faculty of color had spoken directly about their racial perspectives and suggested that students' country of origin, culture, skin color, and accent are significant factors that should be taken into consideration. In the quote below, a participant of color who was born outside the U.S. responded to a white U.S. faculty member, who wondered whether a “lack of confidence” is “a common thing for international students seeking employment in the United States and whether they see that as a barrier or not”. The white participant's question appears to be quite innocent and innocuous. However, the underlying implication may be that an international student's culture, nationality, or language ability are the reason for the lack of confidence, which links this type of discussion to deficit discourse as well as to Bonilla-Silva's

(2014) cultural racism frame. A participant of color in the focus group responded to the question as follows:

Although I wasn't an international student, I was treated as an international student. The lack of confidence comes because of the stereotyping. People will assume, if you have a last name that sounds foreign in U.S. Mainly it's about the skin color, and also the way you look. It's because, a lot of people are not as understanding as you, as you have stated. [...]. So, it's these perceptions, particularly in education, it's bad. People assume that the accent is genetic, like students were saying. I was told, you could not be an English and Psychology teacher because of your accent. The students will pick your accent and speak like you. Excuse me? I had to spend hours telling my students, the accent is not related to your skin color. If you are born in China but you're white, you'll be speaking Mandarin, or whatever language you're speaking. So, the lack of confidence comes from people who make assumptions. You may not say it, but, "Oh, your English is so good," and you may be innocent. It's not like you just want to stereotype. So people are always second-guessing themselves. [...] Because, people listen to the accent, they assume a person is international, and they're not. [...] So, people making assumptions can be very dangerous.

The next comment was from a white U.S. faculty member who asserted that she does not make assumptions. The same participant also showed closed body language by folding her arms at times when she appeared that she may feel uncomfortable or challenged by the discussion. Additionally, it is interesting that the participant of color stated that she “was treated as an international student” in terms of stereotyping, and how she believes that stereotyping behaviors have an impact on an international student’s confidence level. This point is supported by

research on stereotype threat (Steele, 2010) as well as by research on neo-racism, which has shown that international students are forced to cope with negative stereotypes due to “negative social images of particular racial groups [which] are thrust upon immigrants” (Lee & Rice, 2007, p. 395). Moreover, this is also supported by the theme of racial profiling discussed in this study.

Another example that illustrates the dynamics of white fragility occurred after some faculty shared how they provide special supports for international students. In response, another white participant made the following comments that functioned to silence discussion of providing individual supports, deny the need to provide equity in support, and re-center the conversation on the experience of the white faculty member:

It shouldn't make any difference whether they're international students or they're out of Mississippi, if I can use that as an example, or anyone else, that it's personalized learning and exposure that we're providing. [...] Some of the work I do when I walk in they say oh God, here's another old white male. So, you know, I get the other side of that, you know?

When asked further about how they provide individual support to international students, the participants responded that they do not provide individual support to international students, but rather they seek to provide all students with equal access to educational opportunities and supports. At times, these comments, which were framed as supporting all students, appeared to make the white faculty feel more comfortable and safe in the discussions, which was evidenced by the white faculty showing more openness and less defensiveness in terms of their comments and body language in the discussion. Comments about supporting all students were made by a wide range of participants including both the faculty of color and the white faculty.

These dynamics illustrate how participants utilized white fragility in the conversations to reinstate a space characterized by white racial norms. Moreover, white participants in the focus

groups referred to a need to create “safe spaces” for faculty members to gain professional development in the areas of diversity, equity, and inclusion. However, the concept of a “safe space” seemed to function as a proxy for a space where white faculty would feel comfortable and unchallenged in terms of white racial norms. However, research-based practices for effective professional development around racial equity require the opposite, namely that “individuals have to agree to experience discomfort so that they can deal with the reality of race and racism in an honest and forthright way” (Singleton, 2015, p. 74). This finding also aligns with the work of Arao and Clemens (2013) who advocate shifting from safe spaces to “brave spaces” (p. 141).

The faculty of color in the focus groups seemed to be careful to avoid triggering discomfort or white fragility in the white faculty participants. This dynamic of maintaining a “safe space” may have created somewhat of a silencing effect on the faculty of color in terms of what was shared in the focus groups. Additionally, white faculty may want to consider how this dynamic is present and visible to students of color and other diverse student groups in the classroom environments that they create. By creating a “safe space” that centers white comfort, faculty may be unknowingly silencing students of color while creating a classroom environment that seems “inclusive” and “safe” to just the white faculty and white students. The white fragility of faculty, staff, and administrators is more than an issue that occurs on an individual level, but rather it has become a deeply institutionalized structural barrier in U.S. higher education that is very difficult to address.

Theme 2: Colorblind beliefs and teaching practices. Many of the faculty in this study made comments advocating for teaching practices geared toward “all student success, and hopefully that works”. There were many comments indicating that faculty members should provide equal support to all students, avoid exceptions or favoritism, and treat all students

equally. This implies that faculty should focus on what makes students the same and not focus on what makes students different (e.g., race and gender). These types of comments were coded as representative of colorblind beliefs and teaching practices. For example, one math faculty member characterized her belief in providing support equally to all students as follows:

Unless they ask for it, I don't know if they want support, but anybody who's struggling with the subject, regardless of whether they were international or not, I would offer support, and that's what I've continued all along. So, not specifically geared towards international students.

Both the white U.S. faculty and the international faculty of color made comments such as this, which align with colorblind ideology. However, at times colorblind language such as comments about supporting all students functioned in a consensus-seeking way in order to restore a sense of comfort for some of the white participants who showed discomfort at points in the discussion when white racial norms were challenged. This dynamic illustrated how colorblind arguments were used as a defensive move when white fragility was triggered. This finding is supported by research showing that colorblind arguments are constructed to explain contemporary racial inequalities as the result of non-racial dynamics (Bonilla-Silva, 2014).

Avoiding exceptions and favoritism. Some of the participants also spoke directly to the concept of not showing favoritism or making exceptions for individual students. The faculty also discussed the importance of maintaining the appearance of not showing favoritism to someone in the class. For example, one participant discussed how his concept of avoiding exceptions has been challenged in his experience of working with international students:

My challenge with it has been, I've observed and had the experiences that the international students want to do so well, that they're very demanding on the professor's

time, that they want to get to you, they want to talk to you, disproportionately in my opinion. And somebody that has come up through the system a little bit. So you got to balance that time so you don't look like you're showing favoritism or making some exception to that. But I've just found that they would like to have as much time from you as they possibly can.

Although this participant's comments are based on showing fairness to all of the students, research has shown that attempts to support all students equally result in buoying up the students who experience group-based advantages, while further entrenching existing inequalities and generating distrust in women and people of color in the class (Aragón et al., 2017; Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017).

Similarly, another faculty member discussed how his concept of grading everyone equally according to set standards has been challenged by colleagues who have advocated for reflecting inclusion in grading:

They said that the grading process has to reflect inclusion. In order to interpret that, I'd imagine that you should grade people differently, that some people need to be graded less rigorously. That's something that I don't agree with.

Due to their commitment to not showing favoritism, some faculty stated that they only provide differentiated instruction, differentiated assessments, or individualized supports if students provide documentation that they are approved for such accommodations through the disability services office. However, such practice is based on an ideology that does not account for structural forms of oppression and does not take into consideration contemporary research-based practices for providing equitable support and engagement for diverse student populations (see, for instance, Harper & Quaye, 2015; Lee, 2015; Strayhorn, 2012).

Accountability metrics and equity of outcomes. Some faculty who endorsed equal treatment of students took it a step further by advocating for the use of accountability metrics to confirm that they are indeed treating students equally and fairly in terms of outcomes. For instance, one participant discussed the concept of a “data transparency” initiative where all faculty at the university would receive a

snapshot of not just their fail rate for their classes, we get that now, that's relatively new. But who is failing their classes. So let's say that somebody has a high, let's say I have a high fail rate of international students relative to say white female students. I would want to know that [...].

Similarly, another faculty member who endorsed treating students equally also described designing his own metrics to check his implicit biases in order to know that his instruction and grading was as fair as possible:

I try as much as I can to implement practices that limit the ability of my biases to impact things. Like I do blind grading as much as I can. I do random call in the classroom to try to avoid having certain students over talk and certain students under talk. I constantly question myself because I'm afraid of that. So, sometimes if there's an interaction like, oh no, have I been doing that? I'll do things like as a completely separate thing. I was one time worried that my sections of lab, that my second section was just doing better because you know in the first section, I would see all the places that they struggled. Then, I would give all the pro-tips to my second section. So I actually pulled out their grades and I found the averages, plus the standard deviations, and they were within each other's standard deviations. I was like, okay, good. I don't have to worry about favoring one section over another. And I haven't had a large enough concern yet to do that with other

sub-groupings, and like I mentioned before, I can't tell who's a real international student in my class. But I constantly think about these things and if something does make me go, oh, am I? Do I have something? I'll try to look at metrics that I have to see if it's a problem.

By utilizing accountability metrics, participants noted that faculty who strive to treat students equally can have direct feedback about the outcomes of their classes and will have concrete evidence to make decisions about how to adjust their pedagogy in order to support distinct student groups more equitably. The participants discussed that adoption of a university-wide data transparency initiative may help to create more of an environment of accountability for all faculty members around ensuring equity in outcomes across the board, especially if such metrics are linked with hiring, tenure, promotion, and other types of incentives or evaluations. However, this framework of accountability metrics does not take into account how to provide equitable support structures to students based on their needs, and it also does not acknowledge or address structural and institutionalized forms of oppression in terms of policies and practices that impact diverse student populations.

Theme 3: Multicultural beliefs and teaching practices. Many of the faculty in the focus groups also discussed beliefs and teaching practices that involved recognizing differences and providing special supports to students according to their needs. In addition, some faculty discussed how they utilize teaching practices that are specifically affirming of the ethnic, cultural, and linguistic identities of the students in their classes. The participants who endorsed these multicultural beliefs and teaching practices also discussed how these approaches serve to create equity and fairness for all of the students in the class by differentiating instructional techniques.

Differentiating instruction. For example, one participant responded as follows to the colorblind argument that reflecting inclusion in grading would mean grading some people less rigorously:

As far as grading goes, I do think that a student's background does affect how we should approach our grading. I don't say that I would grade less rigorous, but what I have done for students is allow them to, after they've taken an exam, come to me and go through orally in a conversation to say, "Here's what I was thinking on each of these questions." Often, what I realize is that by talking about it or writing something on a board, they're able to explain better what was on their mind than they had on the page. I don't need to do that for every student, but I don't think of it as being less rigorous. I think of it as finding the best way to assess their knowledge.

Other faculty discussed a wide range of other such teaching practices such as allowing the use of bilingual dictionaries when taking exams, answering students' questions regarding the meaning of vocabulary and terminology during exams, making recordings of every lecture available (some faculty discussed providing video with English captions), providing more checking & confirming of understanding of key concepts, connecting international students to support services such as the writing center and the office responsible for providing international student services, as well as helping international students to navigate unfamiliar aspects of the university system in general. For instance, one participant described how he provides support for international students in his courses as follows:

For the language barriers or issues, I have also worked with them to make sure they're understanding the topics and answer their questions. But also in some cases I let them use dictionaries. If they want to bring a dictionary to the exam, I was okay with it as long as I

can check there is nothing else in the dictionary. Some of them have used perhaps, extensions for big paper projects if it was taking them a really long time to go to say, the writing center to get some editing.

These findings are supported by research showing that greater endorsement of multicultural ideology predicts adoption of more inclusive teaching practices (Aragón et al., 2017). However, multicultural beliefs and inclusive teaching practices still operate within a framework that does not challenge the structural barriers that international students of color must navigate (Markus et al., 2000; Plaut et al., 2009; Plaut et al., 2018). These barriers include institutionalized forms of racial profiling, neo-racism, white fragility, and stereotype threat. Critical Race Theory asserts that these barriers are ordinary because racism is the usual way that society does business (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Ladson-Billings, 1999). As a result, other approaches and strategies are needed in order transform the overarching structural barriers that are normalized in U.S. higher education.

Affirming students' identities and making multilingualism the norm. Some participants, particularly the international faculty of color, discussed how they affirm the identities of all of the students in the class by making efforts to create an environment where multilingualism and multiculturalism are the norm. Such culturally-relevant practices are supported by research on student engagement (see, for instance, Emdin, 2016; Harper & Quaye, 2015; Lee, 2015; Pomerantz, 2006; Strayhorn, 2012). For example, one participant described some ways that he has engaged Arabic-speaking international students in his courses:

And then, perhaps one other way, if I knew a little bit about their language, then I was also sometimes referring to the concepts in their language. [...] I have a working understanding of Arabic. And if I have students who speak Arabic, if I talk about the

concept then I also put it on the board, the concept [in Arabic]. So they can also perhaps more directly think about the concept. And then I think that also helps other students to see the native concept for whatever we are talking about, as part of the topic too. Giving those kind of, perhaps, accommodations, but also acknowledgement of their presence and their contribution to the class.

However, some of the multilingual international faculty of color were still in the process of forming their approach to utilizing other languages with students. For example, one participant spoke about how she has found it “tricky” to navigate using Chinese inside and outside the classroom, so that she is both affirming of Chinese-speaking international students’ identities, but also careful not to exclude any non-Chinese speakers in the class:

I'll have students, because they know I speak Chinese and I'm from China, that they'll speak Chinese to me even in the classroom setting. It's tricky. I don't know. [...] Some students will do that, either because they feel more comfortable in Chinese or they don't know how to say a specific term, which I'm more okay with. If there's a term that they don't know how to say in English, I'm happy to translate even in a classroom setting, but I think it's a tricky situation. When you have a professor ... or, as a professor, when you have students who speak the same language. You're totally comfortable with that language. Outside of the classroom, if it's a very casual conversation, I'm more than happy to speak Chinese with them. But, in the classroom, I think it excludes other students if they speak to me in Chinese. But, I think the line, it's pretty tricky. [...] Sometimes, I would say, "If we can talk about these concepts in the language of instruction, that's just more consistent with the language that you're going to write your

assignments in. You're going to write your paper in the same language. We're going to have an exam in this language".

Although some of the white U.S. faculty discussed providing special supports for students according to their needs, it was noteworthy that none of the white U.S. faculty in this study discussed drawing on knowledge of other languages or cultures to affirm students' identities inside or outside of the classroom. Moreover, the white faculty made comments suggesting that international faculty of color may be better able to relate to international students, implying that white U.S. faculty should not be held responsible for the work of supporting international students. This finding is supported by other well-documented instances where the burden of diversity and equity work is placed on a few people of color in predominantly white contexts (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Gillborn, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1999). However, Critical Race Theorists argue that, in order for systems of racism and white supremacy to be transformed in society and in education, whites will need to assume more responsibility for racial equity work (Bell, 1998; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Gillborn, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1999).

Theme 4: Overlap of colorblind and multicultural beliefs and teaching practices.

Some of the ways that participants described their beliefs and teaching practices were representative of an overlap of both colorblind and multicultural ideology. Specifically, these teaching practices were characterized by providing equal opportunities for all students, but with an added component of responding sensitively to the needs of each individual student and helping them in a way that was commensurate to their individual needs, including the consideration of contextual factors.

Showing sensitivity to the context and situation of all students. One participant captured this idea of making available customized context-specific support to all students in the following comment:

A theme I'm hearing is sensitivity to whatever the context and situation is for a student. When you asked the question, I thought of that student that I described, that was concerned about her accent being an impediment to interviewing well, or perhaps getting the job. So, for that student, I offered to conduct a mock interview, let's practice, let's work through this. But, I'd like to think that I'd do that for any student, given their context, and that's what I'm hearing here.

Similarly, another participant discussed how she works to create opportunities for all of the students in a capstone course to connect with the faculty members on an individual basis. As a result, a structure is created where the students all have opportunities to get individualized and customized support according to their needs:

I think making it clear to all of our students that not only can they ask, but we encourage them to ask, and that we have time for them. In the intensive writing, kind of equivalent to the Capstone that I teach, we schedule individual meetings with lots of our students, all of them, international or not, say that's part of the most valuable experiences they've had with our coursework. So, it's not the same for all, but everybody has those opportunities.

This strong integration of colorblind ideology and multicultural ideology with most faculty endorsing both ideologies in this study is an important finding because it draws into relief the ways that both ideologies can be used together to maintain racial inequalities while allowing a simultaneous discourse around diversity, equity, and inclusion. This finding is related to Critical Race Theory's concept of interest convergence, the idea that "the majority group tolerates

advances for racial justice only when it suits its interests to do so” (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017, p. 177). In other words, by creating cosmetic changes around diversity, equity, and inclusion, U.S. colleges and universities can create an impression that advances toward racial equity are being made, while in reality, structural forms of oppression are just being further concealed and entrenched by superficial multicultural efforts. As a result, the racial status quo is maintained by pointing to cosmetic efforts as evidence of progress. This evidence serves to complement and strengthen colorblind arguments that are constructed using the minimization of racism frame and the abstract liberalism frame to explain how racial inequalities are the result of non-racial dynamics (Bonilla-Silva, 2014).

Designing assignments that students can personalize. Some participants discussed the importance of designing assignments where each student has the opportunity to personalize their learning as much as possible. For example, one participant discussed how he utilizes the first assignment to create a space where the students can feel comfortable to be open with the instructor and to connect personally with the content of the course.

One of the first assignments I do is a biographic journal entry, asking them how did politics affect you where you grew up? or what kind of issues have you gone through? And I think those kind of assignments, I have observed, helped them to make connections with the topics, personalize it. But also to feel included. And I also know more about the person. So it's just not a face to me, not just a name. I know that person came, say, from China, their parents wanted to have a second child and he's the second child so he wouldn't actually be born if he was in China. That kind of personal story gives me a good sense of the person that we are dealing with. I think, like any human subject, education is very personal and the more personal connections there is, the more people know about

students, we know about them at an individual level, I think they are more likely to be feeling included and perhaps connect with the topics. I try to let myself to give them, before asking them to have their biographic entry, I tell them how I ended up becoming a professor teaching politics, so I also paint myself vulnerable. My own background, the things that I have dealt with. That also helps to connect with them, not just them telling me about their life story, but I'm also trying to put myself in the same shoes.

Additionally, some faculty discussed how they create a classroom environment where students have opportunities to work in individualized ways to learn the content. For instance, one participant discussed how her classes follow a “flipped” format, where the students encounter the content before class, and class time is used primarily for workshopping and getting individual support from the professor. Similarly, another participant discussed how he supports international students who are working together for linguistic support reasons to continue doing so in class for pair work activities:

I do a couple of things in math courses. As I come into thinking about a student population, students that really do have the largest language barriers, they have many more challenges that they have to work through. I often see students in that situation, where they'll take a course with someone else with the same background, so they can converse amongst themselves. I try to both give those students permission to continue doing that. I often divide students up into groups, for example, in the course. Sometimes, it's randomly. But, if two students have communicated with me they're working together, I tend to keep them together--at least, initially--as a way to say, "Well, okay, you need to continue communicating with me." I make regular opportunities to check in with students so that they're not only conversing amongst themselves but also conversing with other

students because that's useful, too. But to, in a sense, give permission to the struggle, to say, "Okay, you may feel like you're not as comfortable in the language of instruction. You can rely on each other, you can also rely on me." I'm going to--at least, occasionally--require inter-group conversation with students who speak English in a way that they're much more comfortable with. Trying to do early intervention with students who are in a situation where the language might be a barrier is something I do in math.

However, this frame of personalized learning and individualism is also closely related to colorblind racism's notions of meritocracy and abstract liberalism. Research has shown that the abstract liberalism frame can be combined with the minimization of racism frame to construct arguments that explain racial inequalities as the result of individual opportunity or choice while denying the role of institutional and structural forms of oppression (Bonilla-Silva, 2014). Accordingly, this combination of ideologies may discourage faculty members from acknowledging structural inequalities. As a result, faculty members may miss the opportunity to develop cognizance of the perspectives of others and to develop what Ladson-Billings refers to as "informed empathy" in her foreword (Singleton, 2015, p. xvi).

Theme 5: The role of faculty in creating an inclusive campus environment. The participants conceptualized their role as faculty in creating an inclusive campus environment for international students and other diverse student groups as supporting student development, helping students to personalize their learning, and being responsive to students' needs. For example, one international faculty member described the way that he thinks about the role of faculty as follows:

I also agree that we need to really personalize or take in students as individuals and not assume a lot about them, by virtue of their identity or the groups that they may belong to.

I think there is a lot of emphasis on recognizing different cultural, religious, ethnic, racial groups on campus. So I think that's an important step towards inclusiveness. But I think the downside, just focusing on the group identity, would be to stereotype people and just think of them as well international students or Asian, or Chinese. And I think our role should be to help them to bring their individual selves to the educational experience as much as possible. I don't know if there's always a good way to help students in the limited role we play in classrooms, but I have tried to create some assignments perhaps to help students to think about their personal background and how that may matter for the class itself.

This framing acknowledges that the role of faculty in the classroom is limited, but it does not discuss the role that faculty play outside of the classroom in meeting with students individually and supporting them through personal matters that students share with the professor. Ladson-Billings (1995) asserts that faculty should adopt “culturally relevant pedagogy,” which is described by Emdin (2016), as an “approach to teaching [that] advocates for a consideration of the culture of the students in determining the ways in which they are taught. Unfortunately, this approach cannot be implemented unless teachers broaden their scope beyond traditional classroom teaching” (p. 10).

Other participants discussed the importance of being responsive to students’ individual needs and contexts, but did not reference any student engagement or educational pedagogy literature or research-based practices in their comments. For instance, one participant discussed how she provides these types of supports by referring students to resources to help them diversify their practical networks:

I also feel like that's one of our roles as faculty, is to try to respond to students based on what they need, but also to further diversify those practical networks. I think bias also sometimes persists in the way that, it might be more comfortable for me, not deliberate, but that ... The person who comes to mind immediately because of my own biases looks like me, or talks like me, and I put them forward for a job unconsciously, so that's another way in which I'm trying to change my pedagogical practice, or be very intentional with my pedagogical practice, so that I'm supporting and promoting students in a lot of different ways.

The white hero teacher complex. However, the dialogue about the role of faculty had some nuanced problematic undertones at times. For example, a white U.S. participant described the role of the faculty in supporting diverse student populations as follows:

I think our role as faculty [...] is to help people to have space to think and develop their ideas, and to be supported in that thinking and development. So, a lot of that is helping people see themselves and their own voice as valuable. A lot of that is exposing people to different ideas that they maybe haven't been familiar with, and giving them the space and the time to chew on those ideas.

Taken at face value, this statement may come across as a very positive framing of the role of the faculty in supporting diverse students. However, when the white participant talks about “helping people see themselves and their own voice as valuable,” there is a nuanced undertone that is related to the concept of the *white savior complex* or *white hero teacher complex* (Emdin, 2016). By positioning herself as helping diverse student populations to see themselves as valuable, there is an underlying assumption that students of color do not have the ability to see themselves or their own voice as valuable without the help of the faculty member. The underlying tones

connected with the white savior complex were also visible in comments made by other white U.S. participants who shared emotional stories about supporting international students of color through difficult personal situations in order to help them move forward with their life, education, and career. The faculty who told these stories tended to center their own experiences and emotional responses when telling these stories, as opposed to focusing on the students themselves.

Additionally, the participants in this study framed “implicit bias” as one of their greatest challenges for working with international students. This finding is also connected to how faculty discussed relying on racial profiling and stereotyping to identify international students in their classes. This is an indication that faculty members have some understanding that this behavior is problematic, but there is not a clear direction on how to move beyond this frame of profiling and stereotyping. Accordingly, the participants felt that more implicit bias training would be useful for their professional development. In addition to engaging in implicit bias trainings and adopting inclusive teaching practices based on multicultural ideology, Critical Race Theory-framed pedagogy suggests that faculty should reexamine their beliefs in order to develop anti-racist and culturally relevant teaching practices that are informed by a systems-based understanding of overarching structural inequalities in U.S. higher education (Bell, 2007; Davis & Harrison, 2013; Emdin, 2016; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Singleton, 2015; Sue, 2010). However, the participants aptly commented that these types of trainings are often self-selecting and that the same faculty at the institution seem to be the only ones attending the trainings. The participants also made the argument that the university’s leadership should drive the effort to make sure that all faculty receive training in supporting the success of diverse student populations. However, in addition to training for all faculty members, a variety of sustained research-based efforts with

backing leadership commitments have to be continually maintained in order to begin to transform normalized institutional and structural forms of oppression.

Theme 6: The role of leadership in creating an inclusive campus environment.

The participants discussed how both international and non-international students of color have reported to them that the campus environment is not welcoming. The participants reported that some students made comments suggesting that the campus climate did not reflect what was marketed on the website, social media, etc., and that they found the reality to be very different from what they expected. Along the same lines, some of the participants of color in this study also made comments that they did not feel comfortable or supported as faculty of color or as international faculty on campus. For example, a participant of color who was born outside the U.S. commented that sometimes people of color feel like they are “invading the space” when they come to campus:

What the university can do is just to make the whole campus know general things about what to do with people. It's not just international students, but just people of color. Just as we have things for LGBTQ people, and people who have disabilities, it's important for people to feel like they belong. Sometimes people feel like they are invading the space, and they feel like they don't want to come. I know one international student who is a graduate of [the university], our campus, and she was telling me, she never felt safe, so she had to go to LGBTQ [club] and hang out with them, because that is the only place that people were listened to. [...] So, she graduated, but she did not have a good experience.

This resonated with another participant, who added that there is a moral obligation for the leadership, faculty, staff, students, and community to put into place the support structures

necessary to create a safe, welcoming, and positive living and learning environment for international students:

It's clear that we're living through this neo-liberal age, where it's also in the university's financial interest to have more international students. They bring more fees, and there is a competitive environment out there. But, that's part of the reason that we're recruiting so heavily. So, I think in a context like that, there is a moral obligation to build up better human and literal infrastructure to support those students when they come here.

Although this participant believes that there is a moral obligation to put in place support structures, the majority group does not gain any advantage from putting these structures in place. Therefore, from a Critical Race Theory perspective considering interest convergence, the university leadership does not have any obligation to put support structures in place for diverse student populations such as international students (Case & Ngo, 2017; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Gillborn, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1999).

Faculty leadership and creating a drive from the top. To move toward proactively creating an inclusive campus environment in general, the participants indicated that they believe that the university's leadership plays a significant role in this effort. For example, the participants agreed that "there should be a drive from the top" for student support initiatives and that the leadership has the ability to set the tone for realizing the university's values and expectations around these issues. However, the faculty expressed frustration that they have not seen this happen. For instance, one participant commented, "I have had no dealings with the administration about supporting students, but it would be nice to see something develop that supports them." Another participant advocated for the existing faculty committees to be supported by the leadership with more responsive concrete action and clear communication:

I don't know if I would add anything different than what was said. But I think that the administration sets the tone from the top down. Having said that I think on our campus there's been a fair amount of frustration because we've had so many committees, you know? And so many reports written but it all, but if those aren't brought to fruition it seems like this kind of abstract concept and so it needs to have a trickle down that actually matters for when you come into the classroom for the people that, the staff that students run into. It needs to have a trickle down. So they set the tone, but there's got to be all this communication that comes and then finally comes into the classroom.

However, one tenured participant who was involved in faculty leadership asserted that the faculty leadership has the power and ability to make academic and admissions policy changes that could have a tangible effect on the experiences of international students and international faculty at the institution:

I want to pick up on something you said. A couple of us in here are involved in faculty leadership in various ways. We, as per the [university] code, have certain things in our power including personnel decisions where we make recommendations on hiring and tenure and promotion and things like that and we can look at what affects international students in the same way as we look at what affects first generation students and, you know, students of color and things like that. That's one aspect we have. We can set academic policy including admissions policy and things like that. Do we require, what do we require for admission? Do we require language tests, for example. Those are things that are up to the faculty. Do we recognize work with international students when we're looking at tenure packets? Those are things that are well within our ability to change.

Throughout the discussion of leadership, a common thread that emerged was that there has not been any sense of urgency around the need to change institutional policies and practices in order to better support international students and other diverse student populations. Similarly, the university does not receive any direct benefit in terms of finances, academics, reputation, etc. for providing more supportive structures for diverse student populations. This finding aligns with Critical Race Theory's concept of interest convergence, and suggests that the university's leaders who care about these concerns may have to identify ways to create interest convergence in terms of the overarching interests of the institution in order to move forward any initiative aimed at supporting diverse student populations (Case & Ngo, 2017; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017; Gillborn, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1999).

Mixed-Methods Results

This section merges the quantitative survey data set and the qualitative focus group data set for a mixed methods analysis. Specifically, the participants' scores for their endorsement of the constructs of colorblind ideology and multicultural ideology are arrayed with the qualitative themes below. The merged analysis of the two data sets helps to provide a more complex understanding of the relationship between these two constructs in relation to how faculty conceptualize and actualize their role in creating an inclusive campus for international students and other diverse student groups. The quantitative results (Table 4) from the survey and the qualitative themes are repeated below in order to consider their relationship.

Table 4

Participants' Endorsement of Multicultural and Colorblind Ideology Factors

		Multicultural Ideology		
		Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Colorblind Ideology	Disagree	2	0	2
	Neutral	0	0	4
	Agree	0	1	18

Qualitative themes:

1. A Problematic Underlying Context: Who Counts as an International Student?
2. Colorblind Beliefs and Teaching Practices
3. Multicultural Beliefs and Teaching Practices
4. Overlap of Colorblind and Multicultural Beliefs and Teaching Practices
5. The Role of Faculty in Creating an Inclusive Campus
6. The Role of Leadership in Creating an Inclusive Campus

Strong support of both ideologies was apparent in both the quantitative and qualitative data. This was visible in the ways that participants discussed striving to provide both equal treatment as well as individualized supports to students based on their unique contexts and needs. However, each faculty member thought about equality and equity in distinct ways, representing a wide range of complex beliefs and teaching practices. The strong endorsement of colorblind and multicultural ideologies indicates that interest convergence may be operating to uphold systems of privilege and oppression while allowing for cosmetic changes in diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts.

Both the faculty of color and the white faculty discussed a range of beliefs and teaching practices that were related to colorblind and multicultural concepts of fairness, and the faculty members' beliefs and teaching practices discussed in this study intersected in complex overlapping ways. The findings of the present study were consistent with previous studies, which indicated that while the endorsement of multicultural ideology has more positive implications for people of color, both colorblind and multicultural ideology have the potential to further social inequality (Choi, 2008; Markus, et al., 2000; Plaut et al., 2009; Plaut et al., 2018). Specifically, 24 of 27 participants in the present study indicated that they endorsed multicultural ideology, and these faculty discussed utilizing a variety of approaches that would be considered as inclusive teaching practices. Moreover, the three faculty who did not endorse multicultural ideology on the survey discussed teaching practices in the focus group that were centered on equal treatment rather than inclusion.

However, the findings in this study also suggest that both ideologies still operate within a framework that does not challenge institutional, structural, and systemic forms of oppression in the context of U.S. higher education. As suggested by Critical Race Theory-framed pedagogy, normative inclusive teaching practices still center whiteness, and faculty should reexamine their beliefs in order to develop anti-racist and culturally relevant teaching practices that are informed by a systems-based understanding of overarching structural inequalities in education (Bell, 2007; Case & Ngo, 2017; Davis & Harrison, 2013; Emdin, 2016; Gillborn, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Singleton, 2015; Sue, 2010).

Discussion and Conclusion

While some of the faculty in this study discussed racial inequalities in higher education and expressed a strong motivation to learn ways in which they can better support diverse student

populations, the participants did not acknowledge their own complicity in upholding systems of privilege and oppression. Moreover, the faculty in this study did not make any comments that demonstrated a systems-level understanding of how oppression operates in their own institution or in U.S. higher education more broadly. In other words, they could not see the problem clearly.

Instead, the faculty focused on their beliefs and teaching practices that they employ in order to treat all students fairly within the context of a single course. The ways that the faculty thought about oppression were limited to the individual class level, and their beliefs and teaching practices for supporting diverse student populations were based on notions of fairness related to colorblind and multicultural ideologies. These ideologies were vehemently endorsed in such a way that positioned them as something close to objective universal truths, and the faculty did not seem to demonstrate that they were conscious of their unwavering commitments to these ideologies. For instance, when beliefs and practices related to fairness were called into question, it triggered defensiveness, and for the white faculty, the magnitude of this defensiveness was amplified because of how it simultaneously activated their white fragility. In turn, this defensiveness silenced the discussion and functioned to maintain the existing ideological and racial equilibrium.

In this study, the faculty members' defensiveness around ideological fragility and white fragility prevented them from seeing international students of color and other diverse student populations as individuals within a system of exclusion. More broadly, this inability to see students of color as individuals who must navigate and overcome systems of oppression is reflected across the board in U.S. institutions of higher education. In particular, international students of color are not constructed as individuals within a system of exclusion in higher education. Rather, international students are thought of as operating somehow separately from

U.S. notions of diversity, equity, and inclusion. As a result, international students of color are positioned as parallel and separate from U.S. students of color. This creates a structure where international students of color are normatively not reflected in diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts on campus.

Because it is difficult to see oppression clearly and to understand its systemic nature, we tend to name the symptoms as the problem and we create structures to address those symptoms. For instance, we create intrusive advising programs, remedial courses framed as academic supports, conditional admissions policies, diversity offices, international student offices, implicit bias workshops, data transparency initiatives, etc. However, these efforts are focused on the symptoms, are cosmetic in nature, and tend to create only small pockets of equity and inclusion at best. As a result, all of these efforts fail to disrupt the overarching systemic inequalities, allowing the problem to carry on unacknowledged and unaddressed. This study illustrated how well-intentioned beliefs and teaching practices grounded in ideologies of fairness operate within a racialized context to form structural barriers that serve to colonize international students of color.

Furthermore, Critical Race Theory asserts that the voices of people of color are crucial to understanding the nature of systemic racism. In this study, the voices of international faculty of color, many of whom were international students in the U.S. for many years, helped to illustrate the experience of international students and international faculty in U.S. higher education and the ways in which international students and faculty can be included in U.S. higher education. Moreover, the voices of faculty of color in this study helped to challenge the white faculty members' assertions. For instance, the white faculty asserted that international students are characterized by a lack of confidence, and the faculty of color countered by explaining that the

reason for the perceived lack of confidence is due to the repeated stereotyping and profiling behaviors that international students of color experience. This study highlighted how racial profiling, white fragility, and stereotype threat operate on a systemic level to structurally silence and exclude international students of color.

This study also drew into relief the margins of what it means to be “international” or “foreign” as well as the margins of race and the ways in which we racialize individuals based on region of origin, nationality, accent, religion, and other factors. This data helped to illuminate the problematic beliefs, teaching practices, and structures related to race and international status that are normative in U.S. higher education. Additionally, the findings suggest that the experiences of international students of color are connected with the broader context of the experiences of immigrant communities of color who have been perceived as “foreigners” entering the U.S. education system. Accordingly, the ways that faculty members think about “inclusion” of international students of color may reflect and reproduce colonial notions of assimilation and Americanization.

Recommendations for Future Research

More research is needed that centers the voices of international students of color in order to help us understand their experience of U.S. higher education from their perspective, and in turn, to help us understand the ways in which international students of color believe that we can foster more supportive and inclusive living and learning environments. Additionally, more research is needed to understand the ways in which international students of color come into consciousness about racism in the U.S. and how they navigate systems of oppression that structurally segregate and silence them in U.S. higher education.

Future research could focus on enhancing our understanding of systemic forms of oppression by exposing ways in which racial profiling, deficit-thinking, stereotype threat, and white fragility function to exclude international students of color. Additionally, researchers could also explore how institutions can design and implement systems-based strategies for transforming racism and other forms of oppression at institutional and structural levels including rethinking what professional development for faculty members should look like. Such research could contribute to transforming oppressive systems and creating more supportive, inclusive, and affirming learning environments for international students of color.

Recommendations for Future Practice

It is critical that we foster multiple perspectives in how we define what inclusion, equity, and student engagement mean in the context of international student experiences in U.S. higher education. This requires creating concrete structures to include the voices of international students of color and other diverse student populations. Furthermore, we must foster critical awareness of racism and other forms of systemic inequality. We must push beyond the current cosmetic framework of diversity, equity, and inclusion in higher education, which primarily serves institutional interests related to marketing, enrollment management, and projecting a positive institutional image. Rather, we must strive to develop ways of generating systems transformation. Freire (1972) asserts that,

to surmount the situation of oppression, people must first critically recognize its causes, so that through transforming action they can create a new situation, one which makes possible the pursuit of a fuller humanity. [...] The oppressor is solidary with the oppressed only when he stops regarding the oppressed as an abstract category and sees them as persons who have been unjustly dealt with, deprived of their voice, cheated in the

sale of their labor – when he stops making pious, sentimental, and individualistic gestures and risks an act of love” (pp. 47-50).

Likewise, as faculty members, educational leaders, and higher education practitioners, we must develop a critical consciousness of the ways in which we are complicit in perpetuating systems of oppression, and we must strive to reflect on our actions to transform them.

Additionally, it is crucial to develop sustained authentic relationships with people whose lenses differ from our own in terms of beliefs, culture, language, race, gender, sexual orientation, or other factors. In this way, these relationships help us to develop a profound respect for others and help us to take away our fear of the unknown. Accordingly, relationships have the power to expand the boundaries of our perception, empathy, and understanding. Opportunities to develop meaningful relationships and to engage in communities are all around us, including classes, university events, community events, international education opportunities, professional development opportunities, and professional learning communities to name a few.

If we are serious about addressing social inequality, including the systemic exclusion of international students of color, it is absolutely crucial that we push beyond understanding racism, nativism, and xenophobia and other forms of oppression as individual level phenomena. Rather, we must begin by taking responsibility for our own cultural conditioning and biases and develop the critical consciousness needed to understand the structural nature of oppression. In this way, we can develop the empathy and cognizance required to see institutional dynamics from the vantage point of diverse student populations. However, it is not enough that we simply gain a clear understanding of racism and oppression. We also need to take action, including reexamining our own beliefs and life trajectories, in order to understand the ways in which our lives have been shaped by systems of privilege and oppression. Accordingly, educators can move

toward adopting what Freire (1972) refers to as *praxis*, which he defines as “reflection and action directed at the structures to be transformed” (p. 126). Through developing an approach to teaching, learning, and scholarship that combines an understanding of structural forms of oppression with reflexivity and action, it is possible to develop a positive anti-racist identity, where the work of engaging diverse student populations can be approached from a place of integrity.

References

- Akom, A. A. (2001). Racial profiling at school: The politics of race and discipline at Berkeley High. In W. Ayers, B. Dohrn, & R. Ayers (Eds.), *Zero tolerance: Resisting the drive for punishment in our schools: A handbook for parents, students, educators, and citizens* (pp. 51–63). New York, NY: New Press.
- Ammigan, R., & Jones, E. (2018). Improving the student experience: Learning from a comparative study of international student satisfaction. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22(4), 283–301.
- Aragón, O., Dovidio, J., & Graham M. (2017). Colorblind and multicultural ideologies are associated with faculty adoption of inclusive teaching practices. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 10(3), 201-215.
- Arao, B., & Clemens, K. (2013). From safe spaces to brave spaces. In L. Landreman (Ed.), *The art of effective facilitation: Reflections from social justice educators* (pp. 135–150). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publications.
- Au, W., Brown, A. L., & Calderón, D. (2016). *Reclaiming the multicultural roots of U.S. curriculum: Communities of color and official knowledge in education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Baldwin, J. (1963). *The fire next time*. New York, NY: The Dial Press.
- Bell, D. (1998). *Afrolantica legacies*. Chicago, IL: Third World Press.
- Bell, L. A. (2007). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2014). *Racism without racists*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bu, L. (2001). The challenge of race relations: American ecumenism and foreign student nationalism 1900-1940. *Journal of American Studies*, 35(2), 217-237.
- 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.
- Case, A. & Ngo, B. (2017) "Do we have to call it that?" The response of neoliberal multiculturalism to college antiracism efforts. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 19(4), 215-222.
- Chan, E. L. (2016). Student voices inform practice: Perceptions of linguistic and cultural discrimination. In Hastings, C. & Jacob, L. (Eds.), *Social justice in English language teaching* (pp. 135-146). Alexandria, VA: TESOL Press.
- Cho, J., & Yu, H. (2015). Roles of university support for international students in the United States: Analysis of a systematic model of university identification, university support, and psychological well-being. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 19(1), 11–27.
- Choi, J. (2008). Unlearning colorblind ideologies in education class. *Educational Foundations*, 22, 52-71.

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Davis, T. & Harrison, L. M. (2013). *Advancing social justice: Tools, pedagogies, and strategies to transform your campus*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- DiAngelo, R. J. (2006). The production of whiteness in education: Asian international students in a college classroom. *Teachers College Record*, 108(10), 1983-2000.
- DiAngelo, R. J. (2011). White fragility. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3(3), 54-70.
- Emdin, C. (2016). *For white folks who teach in the hood... and the rest of y'all too: Reality pedagogy and urban education*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Fowler, F. (2014). *Survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Herder and Herder.
- Fries-Britt, S., Mwangi, C. A., & Peralta, A. M. (2014). Learning race in a U.S. context: An emergent framework on the perceptions of race among foreign-born students of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 7(1), 1-13.
- Gillborn, D. (2008). *Racism and education: Coincidence or conspiracy?*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Glass, C. R., Kociolek, E., Wongtrirat, R., Lynch, J., & Cong, C. (2015). Uneven experiences: Impact of student-faculty interactions on international students' sense of belonging. *Journal of International Students*, 5(4), 353-367.

- Glass, C. R., Wongtrirat, R., & Buus, S. (2015). *International student engagement: Strategies for creating inclusive, connected, and purposeful campus environments*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- 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.
- Harklau, L. (1999). Representations of immigrant language minorities in US higher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 2*(2). 257-280.
- Harper, S. R. & Quaye, S. J. (2015). Making engagement equitable for students in U.S. higher education. In Quaye, S. J. & Harper, S. R. (Eds.), *Student engagement in higher education* (pp. 1-14). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Holmes, M., Fanning, C., Morales, A., Espinoza, P., & Herrera, S. (2012). Contextualizing the path to academic success: Culturally and linguistically diverse students gaining voice and agency in higher education. In Y. Kanno, & L. Harklau (Eds.), *Linguistic minority students go to college: Preparation, access, and persistence* (pp. 201-219). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hung, H., & Hyun, E. (2010). East Asian international graduate students' epistemological experiences in an American university. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 34*, 340-353.
- Institute of International Education. (2017). *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved April 14, 2018, from <http://www.iie.org/opendoors>

- Iverson, S. V., & Jagers, D. (2015). Racial profiling as institutional practice: Theorizing the experiences of black male undergraduates. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 52*(1), 38–49.
- Kanno, Y., & Grosik, S. A. (2012). Immigrant English learner's transitions to university: Student challenges and institutional policies. In Y. Kanno, & L. Harklau (Eds.), *Linguistic minority students go to college: Preparation, access, and persistence* (pp. 130-147). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Knowles, E. D., Lowery, B. S., Hogan, C. M., & Chow, R. M. (2009). On the malleability of ideology: Motivated construals of color blindness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 857–869.
- Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2006). Race and TESOL: Introduction to concepts and theories. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(3), 471-493.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Just what is critical race theory, and what's it doing in a nice field like education? In L. Parker, d. Deyhele, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is... race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 7-30). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Lee, E. L. (2007). Linguistic and cultural factors in east Asian students' oral participation in U.S. university classrooms. *International Education, 36*(3), 27-47.
- Lee, J. J. (2010). International students' experiences and attitudes at a US host institution: Self-reports and future recommendations. *Journal of Research in International Education, 9*(1), 66–84.

- Lee, J. J., & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of discrimination. *Higher Education*, 53, 381-409. Doi: 10.1007/s10734-005-4508-3
- Lee, J. L. (2015). Engaging international students. In Quaye, S. J. & Harper, S. R. (Eds.), *Student engagement in higher education* (pp. 105-120). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Loo, B. (2019, March 26). International students and experiences with race in the United States. *WES: World Education News and Reviews*. Retrieved from <https://wenr.wes.org>
- Mahboob, A. & Szenes, E. (2007). Linguicism and racism in assessment practices in higher education. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, 3(3). 325-354.
- Markus, H. R., Steele, C. M., & Steele, D. M. (2000). Colorblindness as a barrier to inclusion: Assimilation and nonimmigrant minorities. In Shweder, R. A., Minow, M., & Markus, H. R. (Eds.), *The end of tolerance: Engaging cultural differences; Special issue of Daedalus*, 129(4), (pp. 233-259).
- Marshall, S. (2010). Re-becoming ESL: Multilingual university students and a deficit identity. *Language and Education*, 24, 41-56.
- Martella, R., Nelson, J., Morgan, R., Marchand-Martella, N. (2013). *Understanding and interpreting educational research*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- McCoy, D. L., Winkle-Wagner, R., & Luedke, C. L. (2015). Colorblind mentoring? Exploring white faculty mentoring of students of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 8(4), 225-242.
- Montgomery, C. (2010). *Understanding the international student experience*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Motha, S. (2014). *Race, empire, and English language teaching: Creating responsible and ethical anti-racist practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Neville, H. A., Awad, G. H., Brooks, J. E., Flores, M. P., & Bluemel, J., & the National Science and Technology Council Committee on STEM Education. (2013). Color-blind racial ideology: Theory, training, and measurement implications in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 68, 455–466.
- Ng, S. H. (2007). Language-based discrimination: Blatant and subtle forms. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 26(2), 106-122.
- Oropeza, M. V., Varghese, M. M., & Kanno, Y. (2010). Linguistic minority students in higher education: Using, resisting, and negotiating multiple labels. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 43(2), 216-231.
- Patel, L. (2016). *Decolonizing educational research: From ownership to answerability*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities? *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 444–446.
- Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., Hurd, K., & Romano, C. A. (2018). Do color blindness and multiculturalism remedy or foster discrimination and racism? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(3), 200–206.
- Pomerantz, N. (2006). Student engagement: A new paradigm for student affairs. *College Student Affairs Journal*. 25(2), 176-185.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Shapiro, S. (2012). Citizens vs. aliens: How institutional policies construct linguistic minority students. In Y. Kanno, & L. Harklau (Eds.), *Linguistic minority students go to college: Preparation, access, and persistence* (pp. 238-254). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Shapiro, S., Farrelly, R., & Tomaš, Z. (2014). *Fostering international student success in higher education*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL International Association.
- Singleton, G. E. (2015). *Courageous conversations about race: A field guide for achieving equity in schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, A SAGE Company.
- Strayhorn, T. (2012). *College students sense of belonging: A key to educational success for all students*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Steele, C. M. (2010). *Whistling vivaldi: How stereotypes affect us and what we can do*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Trice, A. G. (2003). Faculty perceptions of graduate international students: The benefits and challenges. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(4), 379-403.
- Trice, A. G. (2007). Faculty perspectives regarding graduate international students' isolation from host national students. *International Education Journal*, 8(1), 108-117.
- Valdez, G. (2015). U.S. higher education classroom experiences of undergraduate Chinese international students. *Journal of International Students*, 5(2), 188-200.
- Viggiano, T., López Damián, A. I., Morales Vázquez, E., & Levin, J. S. (2018). The others: Equitable access, international students, and the community college. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22(1), 71-85.

Wadsworth, B. C., Hecht, M. L., & Jung, E. (2008). The role of identity gaps, discrimination, and acculturation in international students' educational satisfaction in American classrooms. *Communication Education, 57*(1), 64-87.

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.

Appendix A

This survey has two sections. In the first section we will ask four questions related to teaching in your academic discipline. In the second section, we will ask fourteen demographic questions related to you. Results will never be disaggregated in any way that may breach the

confidentiality of participants. Please remember that your spontaneous responses are important and there are no right or wrong answers.

Section I: Questions related to teaching in your academic discipline	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Disagree Slightly 3	Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4	Agree Slightly 5	Agree 6	Strongly Agree 7
Q1: I believe in treating every student equally as a person who has an equal opportunity to be outstanding in my academic discipline.							
Q2: I believe that in an inclusive classroom educators should focus on what makes students the same and not focus on what makes students different (e.g., race and gender).							
Q3: I believe that we should make special efforts to be supportive of underrepresented students (i.e., female students and/or students of color).							

Q4: I believe that an inclusive classroom is achieved when we embrace the qualities that make us different.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Section II: Questions related to you

Q5: How long have you been teaching at the [present institution]?

Q6: How long have you been teaching at the college/university level overall?

Q7: Have you taught primarily undergraduate or graduate students?

Q8: What position are you within the academy (lecturer, senior lecturer, principle lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, full professor)?

Q9: Is your position tenured, tenure-track, or non tenure-track?

Q10: What is the school/program, division, and/or major that you are associated with? (e.g., Education, Physics...)

Q11: Please think about the class with the largest enrollment of international students among the classes that you have taught (at current institution or at any institution where you have taught).

Approximately what was the percentage of international student enrollment?

Q12: Which countries of origin are the most represented among the international students that you have taught (at current institution or at any institution where you have taught)?

Q13: Which races are the most represented among the international students that you have taught?

Q14: Please indicate your age.

Q15: To which gender identity do you most identify?

Q16: What is your race/ethnicity?

Q17: What is your country of origin?

Q18: Were you ever an international student? If so, in which country, and for what length of time did you study?

Appendix B

Question Protocol for Focus Groups

Q1: How would you describe your experience with teaching international students?

Q2: In what ways do international students add value to your classes?

Q3: What are the challenges of teaching international students?

Q4: How do you support international students in comparison to other students in your classes?

Q5: What types of individual support do you offer to international students?

Q6: What do you believe is your role as a faculty member in creating an inclusive campus for international students and for other diverse student populations?

Q7: Who else should be responsible for creating an inclusive campus environment for diverse student populations?

Q8: In what ways are you supported by the university's leadership in your work of teaching and advising international students and other diverse student populations on campus?

Q9: In what additional ways would you like to be supported by the university's leadership in order to more effectively serve international students and other diverse student populations on campus?

Appendix C

Summary Notes from Focus Group Sessions

Focus group 1. The first focus group had seven participants. Participant #3 dominated the conversation and provided a lot of examples and stories that illustrated the racism/xenophobia that she has personally experienced. Participant #6 from the SOE had to leave early. Participant #2 from the SOE stated that he did not have any experience teaching international students. 1, 3, and 5 spoke to experiences of being international students in the US. The white faculty (2, 4, and 7) made comments about being sensitive to the context and situation of all students and everyone seemed to agree with these comments.

Field notes. Field notes taken during the first focus group session are listed below in chronological order, which captures the progression of discussion in the focus group session:

- I usually don't ask students about their race and ethnicity and which country they are from unless they tell me.
- In math you can tell an international student because they might be technically capable, but the terminology trips them out.
- One faculty participant had to seek help from a specialist in the learning and writing center to learn how to help international students with writing their capstone project. She says that she had to seek help for a couple domestic students as well, just different kinds of challenges.
- Faculty make the assumption that students coming in with less language ability or seem less acculturated are international students in undergrad classes. In grad classes, faculty

are more involved in the admissions process and know where each of the students is coming from.

- If people are comfortable and we create these inclusive communities, it benefits everyone.
- Since I am not born in the United States, I have found that international students are very supportive of other people who are not native born Americans. International students had a deeper understanding, they were less judgmental, and less looking for the bad things. It makes the person who is not born here feel more at home.
- People listen to the accent and they assume a person is international and they're not.
- People making assumptions can be very dangerous. [Next white comment:] I don't make assumptions.
- Lack of confidence theme. Helping build up confidence. White faculty says she understands because of her experience as an international student herself. Story about student needing to build up confidence for a job interview.
- The lack of confidence comes because of stereotyping. People will assume because you have a last name that sounds foreign in the U.S. or your skin color or the way you look. You may not say it, but, "oh, your English is so good," and you may be innocent. It's not like you just want to stereotype.
- Story about Dean asking why her English is so good and CLEP tests being "lost".
- Biggest challenge to teach international students is to be aware of own implicit bias.
- All students (both international and domestic) who have international experience add value to the class (including domestic students with experience abroad).

- A challenge is not making assumptions about people. Trying to become more adept and skilled at creating a classroom and relationships where people feel comfortable for who we are, all of us.
- Asking students to speak to specific topics that the faculty member knows they are knowledgeable about in class without essentializing them.
- International students call into question idioms and cultural references that people do not think about and bring different perspectives on ways of doing things.
- Baseball field example of when teaching a tutorial section for undergraduate calculus as an international student herself.
- Story about teaching literacy to group of wives who were all accomplished women. What I learned is never to make assumptions about people's background.
- Anybody who's struggling with the subject, regardless of whether they are international or not, I would offer support. So, not specifically geared toward international students.
- I offer support for every student. When you build a rapport with the students, they will reach out to you, no matter what kind of needs they might have.
- Listening to students and what they disclose: for example, DACA/undocumented students. I never really think of them as international students because they're usually students who have been here since they were like two.
- All our students have challenges and things to contribute. That may be related to an international status, and it might not be.
- Making it clear to all our students that they can ask, we encourage them to ask, and we have time for them. Scheduling individual meetings with students.

- Navigating privacy, boundaries, not pushing or inserting myself, not overreaching. I think female students, I have a closer rapport where this seems to happen, whereas, with my male international students, it's not as a close and immediate for whatever reason.
- Undocumented students left a class and did not come back. She had to write a letter for the students with dates they attended class for some documentation for some reason.
- Example of Muslim student attacked in Florida after 9/11, providing support to students who are facing emergencies or political aspects in their home country. People need to be sensitive to political things happening, because sometimes students can disappear and never come back.
- Sensitivity to whatever the context and situation is for a student. Example of mock interview to help with confidence – I'd like to think that I would do that for any student and that's what I'm hearing here.
- Our role as faculty is to respond to students based on what they need, and to further diversify those practical networks (recommending students of color and international students for jobs).
- The role of faculty is creating a space to think and develop and helping people see themselves and their own voice as valuable.
- I think everybody has a voice that is valuable, and worth promoting, and worth finding, and worth pursuing. I want to support all students in doing that.
- Some academic fields are dominated by white researchers from a few universities. It is important to present diverse academic voices to the students that reflect multiple cultures and lenses to be inclusive. Also, it is the instructor's responsibility to be aware of these types of knowledge.

- We need to attend to our own professional development as faculty members, departments, schools, and programs to explore biases and how we think in ethnocentric terms.
- In the context of international student recruitment for financial reasons, there is a moral obligation to build up more human and literal infrastructure to support those students when they come here.
- Faculty need support and training to create classroom spaces that do not reproduce systems of privilege.
- Residence halls needed at the university
- Maslow pyramid – caring for basic needs, cafeteria, safety, etc.
- One faculty has felt insulted. A colleague told her at lunch that black women do not feel pain at childbirth.
- Microaggressions
- I have never had communication with the university's leadership about how to support international students. I would like to be more aware of what the university's resources for international students are if those exist.
- I got this influx of Chinese students taking my capstone course the second time around, which was cool. I mean, that's good, right?
- I would love to see if our campus can support those kinds of informal organizations or support groups. Provide a space to get together, or to advertise to the new coming students that we have these types of support groups.
- Providing some programming or support for students during holidays when people have gone home.

- I would also like guidance on what not to do. Mobilizing and creating safe spaces to hear from faculty who can speak to what is useful and beneficial for students, I think maybe part of that then is helping more of us understand what do you not do.
- We're the front lines/touch points for students so it's really important that we're doing this right.
- It's not just international students, but just people of color. Just as we have things for LGBTQ people, and people with disabilities, it's important for people to feel like they belong. Sometimes people feel like they are invading the space, and they feel like they don't want to come.
- Having a place people can feel safe – international student who joined the LGBTQ club story
- Greetings in different languages, flags, boasting that we have students from 50 countries. Something visible
- Billionaires from China and other parts of the world can bring some of that money here. We should recruit more international students, so that we could buy some more computers.
- Other students are responsible for creating an inclusive environment. Study abroad may help to plant some humility around how dislocating it can be to be in a different culture and navigate a different environment.

Focus group 2. The second focus group had three participants. Participants 1 and 2 spoke to experiences of being international students in the US. More in-depth data was collected from each participant because the group was smaller. Compared to FG1, we went into more depth on the topics of who counts as an international student, differentiated instruction, implicit bias, and

creating an inclusive campus. Discussed the concept that supporting international students is part of the same overarching conversation about inclusion and equity. Discussed a lot of specific programs at the current institution. Discussed leadership support for international faculty at the university. Discussed how faculty members' positionality and how they are also racialized by students and others: e.g. "here, I'm just another white guy".

Field notes. Field notes taken during the second focus group session are listed below in chronological order, which captures the progression of discussion in the focus group session:

- Korean faculty member has had many Korean students sign up for his class, but a lot of them were actually born and raised in the US. Then, they are not international students, but they are kind of identifying themselves as Korean-American, so it's still I think minority.
- Two faculty made the point that they don't ask where students are from. Most of the time it's revealed because of language difficulties or some other sign. For example, a few students who stick together and speak another language amongst themselves.
- International students bring unique perspectives to international politics topics that appear neutral or straightforward to Americans; different methods and ways of doing things in math/physics.
- Not putting a student on the spot to speak for wherever they are coming from. Their presence brings the global context to the classroom.
- International students are quiet, but international faculty have found that sharing their own experiences helps international students to feel more comfortable sharing their stories in class.

- Differences in cultural attitude when it comes to relationships, respect, and also what is the goal of education. Is it just to accumulate knowledge or to become critical thinkers, or to experience the social relationships, navigate different questions.
- Helping students to understand the real meaning of the concept when there is not an exact translation in another language, or the translation has a different connotation. It can be a strength too because they can bring a different meaning to the concept.
- Challenge is dealing with cases where it is not clear if there is a language barrier issue or if it's actually content. I suggest students to get support from the writing center.
- Challenges have to do primarily with students from Asia, from China. Students are more interested in getting a formula to get the right answer and to get the grade rather than an interest in understanding. This impulse can be present in students from anywhere.
- A lot of international students focus on the result and the grade while American students can enjoy the process itself.
- Cheating – faculty perceived that papers were plagiarized because the papers were too polished, but no evidence. A faculty in FG4 also made the comment that international students will buy a paper online.
- For me, I'm mostly focused on perceiving and trying to help overcome language issues (students can come up and ask questions if they don't understand something during an exam; present new content using standard vocabulary and analogies to help students form an image of what's being discussed).
- Students can bring a dictionary to the exam, extensions for big paper projects if it was taking a long time to go to the writing center for editing.

- Referring to concepts in students' first language (Arabic for example). It helps the international students to think more directly about the concept and helps the other students to see the native concept for whatever we are talking about.
- Acknowledgement of their presence and contribution to the class.
- International students feel some kind of wall between the students and the instructors so they are not willing to really come to the instructor outside of the classroom.
- Faculty try to be informal or use jokes in the classroom to appear more approachable and to establish rapport with students to make the students feel more comfortable.
- We cannot make assumptions that people will have certain difficulties due to particular group identities that they have. I try to get to know everyone as best as I can in the short time we have. If I recognize that something is going on, I just step and have a conversation.
- I think our role should be to help them to bring their individual selves to the educational experience as much as possible.
- Personalizing instruction and getting to know students as individuals through assignments helps students to feel included and helps them to connect with the topics.
- I paint myself vulnerable and tell them about my background and the things that I have dealt with. I try to put myself in the same shoes to help to connect with them.
- I also launched some research studies that focus on international students, and I want to really be more involved in the international student affairs, but I don't know, there are not many activities on campus about those kind of issues.
- Increasing awareness and acknowledging international students and faculty on campus through an international fair for example. Increase awareness of services and resources

on campus for international students and increase faculty awareness of these services, so that they can direct students to the resources.

- Admissions, advising, student services should be responsible for creating an inclusive environment for international students. Campus culture in regard to being accepting of diversity.
- One international faculty noted that he has experienced difficulties on this campus too, and that increasing awareness, more understanding about the international students or ethnic minorities on campus would be great. I think it's important that we can actually figure out who are those people who may need extra help, or specialized help, so I think this kind of conversation on campus is great opportunities to think about this issue.

Institutional self-reflection and self-study that's ongoing is essential. It is has to be a concerted effort and an ongoing cycle.

Focus group 3. The third focus group had eleven participants. 5 participants spoke to experiences of being international students (1, 2, 5, 6, and 10) and positionality as international faculty. Some of the international faculty spoke to the idea that supporting international students is part of the larger conversation of supporting all diverse student groups. Six participants self-identified as white. Some comments were made in regard to international faculty being better suited to support international students because they can relate to them better/they have more in common. Participant #4 noted that he does a lot of work around diversity and equity, but when he walks into the room, people are thinking "oh God, not another old white guy, so I get the reverse of that too."

Field notes. Field notes taken during the third focus group session are listed below in chronological order, which captures the progression of discussion in the focus group session:

- Students who self-identify as international students; students who disclose due to travel affecting class attendance
- Assuming based on characteristics/profiling (accent, questions about the general US, unfamiliarity with idioms or certain vocabulary); difficult to tell because “there are immigrants who are on the margin of what you call international but not quite”.
- Experience is different teaching international students at the graduate level vs. undergrad level
- Faculty create assignments or discussions that provide spaces for students to disclose information about themselves and their life experience. (maps of meaning about different cultures/countries)
- International students are motivated, they want to be there, don't play around as much
- Students add a lot more character to the story
- They tell my students things – other students – that they would never have known, right, if they had just been in Washington state. So, they bring that experience and those examples to the classroom in ways that are really valuable.
- International students bring different approaches and different ways of working to group work that is useful for the other students to encounter differently thinking about things.
- Plagiarism (more at the masters or undergraduate level than doctorate level)
- Interpersonal differences due to a dynamic where international students may feel that their perspective is valued less than the instructor's perspective.
- Western culture vs eastern culture

- Perhaps it's a language of not wanting to speak up. I don't really think necessarily that there's, I don't know, was it the question about challenges? Yeah, I mean maybe but no more than one is challenged by students in general.
- Asian students' come from an educational model that is "just give me content", and they come to the U.S. because of the creative nature and collaborative nature that they don't always get at their home institutions.
- Asian students tend to have a high reverence for the teachers, so they respect you a lot and they try not to question or argue with you.
- Asking for a definition of a science word. I don't try to like do anything specifically pinpointing international students if that makes sense.
- Record all lectures.
- Flipped classroom with lectures beforehand and group work and individual work during class.
- I try to put all the foreign students – all what I perceive to be foreign students – to put them in separate teams so they can work with the locals.
- Checking in with students outside of class, so not to call them out in class.
- Faculty with similar identities (female, international, etc.) have empathy for international students' situation and feel they can help them more due to having similar identities.
- International students are very demanding on the professor's time. You got to balance that time so you look like you're not showing favoritism or making some exception to that.
- Highlighting resources – first generation students also need this. I try to do very specifically to benefit everyone.

- Dictionary/electronic translator allowed for exams if they show me that they're not – it's not attached to the internet or its not in that way.
- Differentiated instruction/extra time on an exam is not appropriate unless there is a disability involved.
- Making sure the classroom is a safe and inclusive space.
- Faculty feel that it is not their responsibility to organize international student events on campus, rather the office of global affairs should organize some events, and it should be a strategic initiative too.
- Role of faculty leadership in creating policy
- Needs to be a commitment from leadership that will guide the action. A drive from the top. Administration sets the tone from the top down.
- Students and community bear some responsibility for creating an inclusive campus environment.
- Faculty are given a lot of tools (emails, links, etc.), but what we're lacking is how to really put it into practice or somehow utilize it intentionally. It's hard to dig for information, it's hard to be proactive about things.
- SEED training course and EMBRACE (strengthening educational excellence through diversity), geared toward equity and inclusion in general. I don't think that I've ever received anything about supporting international students specifically and I think that would be worthwhile.
- Due to being so time challenged, it may be better to bring experts into our units during required training times and service times where they could come in and educate us on

how to incorporate some techniques into our classrooms or in our way we deal with the students.

- One faculty took a sabbatical to a country where he does not speak the language very well. Helped give him perspective to see it from the other direction.
- It shouldn't make any difference whether they're international students or they're out of Mississippi, if I can use that as an example, or anyone else that it's personalized learning and exposure that we're providing.
- Visa issues, immigration policy,
- We cannot separate international students from other students. Like every student has their own identity that some ways they are so, but every group has their specific needs. This work can be applied to other diverse groups of students too.
- Undocumented students, homeless students, pantry on campus, resources on campus, one faculty googled the international office to look at resources.
- Students don't feel the campus is welcoming, story about an international student not knowing where to go for help and faculty taking him to the international office for the first time. Student was totally lost on the campus.
- Lenard school has an advisor dedicated to international students.
- [program name] and [program name] are all faculty who want to do those things, but it is self-selecting.
- COIL collaborative online international learning. Story about students working with groups in Vietnam online and students having assumptions about Vietnamese students.
- One faculty took an implicit bias workshop to remove her implicit bias. Another faculty engaged in a variety of training mechanisms throughout his career.

Blind grading to limit the ability of bias to impact things, random call in the classroom to making talk time more even, using metrics to determine if faculty is favoring any group in the class, data transparency.

Focus group 4. The fourth focus group had six participants. Four participants identified as people of color. Two identified as white. Two identified as having countries of origin outside the US. Participant 4 had over 50 years of teaching experience and indicated the he agreed with colorblind ideology and not multicultural ideology. He made comments such as “grades to do not have to do with inclusion”. Participant 2 agreed with multicultural ideology and not colorblind ideology and he discussed ways that he differentiates instruction to support students. Participant 5 spoke to her experience as international student from China and how she navigates faculty-student relationships with students who speak Chinese as their first language.

Field notes. Field notes taken during the fourth focus group session are listed below in chronological order, which captures the progression of discussion in the focus group session:

- Assumptions – faculty assume that multilingual students of color are international students, in particular when these students are perceived by faculty to show a lack of confidence in speaking or writing.
- International students are conceptualized as anyone perceived as a “foreigner” by the faculty. One faculty mentioned that he includes second generation immigrants in this group.
- One faculty member mentioned that international students who came to the U.S. for high school or earlier are more acculturated and understand the system, so they are “less of an international student” than others.

- Faculty see their role as making themselves available to all students and referring students to support services as needed.
- Faculty feel alone in that there is not clear guidance in regard to how they should be supporting diverse student groups.
- Faculty would like to see a more formal coordinated effort in regard to engaging faculty in supporting students inside and outside the classroom.
- Faculty feel the campus may need some improvements to infrastructure to make it more welcoming and supportive for students (residence halls, cafeteria, groceries, etc.)
- Emphasis on employing teaching practices that benefit all students, rather than teaching in a way that would just benefit a particular group such as international students.
(however, isn't every teaching practice specifically engaging for some students and disengaging for others?)
- Statements made in regard to international students are often qualified by stating that their comment is true of all students, not just international students.
Faculty state that a student's "background" does not matter and should not matter in regard to the way they teach.