

**Foreign and US-Educated Faculty Members' Views on What Constitutes Excellent Teaching**

by

Emad A. Ismail

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate School of  
Auburn University  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the Degree of  
Doctoral of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama  
August, 2014

Keywords: Foreign-educated faculty, Teaching excellence, Teacher Behavior Checklist

Copyright 2014 by Emad A. Ismail

Approved by

James Groccia, Chair, Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and  
Technology  
James Witte, Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology  
Maria Witte, Professor of Educational Foundation, Leadership and Technology  
William Buskist, Professor of Psychology

## Abstract

This study aimed to identify key views of foreign-educated who teach in American universities on what constitutes excellence in teaching based on different demographics using online version of the Teacher Behavior Checklist (Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley & Saville, 2002). Faculty were asked to rank the top 10 of 28 teacher qualities for excellent teaching from their own perspectives. The survey was sent by email to 5238 faculty members from the 14 members of SREB institutions (Southern Regional Educational Board). The final faculty population consisted of 448 participants, of which 309 (69%) were US-educated and 139 (31%) were foreign educated with the majority from Asia and Europe.

Results showed that both US- and foreign-educated faculty universally agreed on eight qualities as most important for excellent teaching, although in different order. These qualities/behaviors were: 1) knowledgeable about topic, 2) enthusiastic about teaching, 3) creative/interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, 8) manages class time/punctuality. “Confident” was ranked number (9) in many cases. “Knowledgeable” and “enthusiastic” were generally ranked number 1 and 2 top qualities. Demographic characteristics of faculty did not affect the selection of these eight qualities as most important to excellent teaching; however the order of some qualities was statistically significantly different between US- and foreign-educated faculty within the different demographic characteristics. Foreign-educated faculty tended to rank “confident,” “effective communicator,” and “encourages and cares” significantly higher than

US-educated faculty within different demographics. US-educated faculty ranked “enthusiastic about teaching” significantly higher than foreign-educated faculty within different demographics. The findings of this study emphasize the importance of confidence and interpersonal skill to foreign-educated faculty which imply the need for greater support and specific developmental programs for this group, especially in their early career.

## Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to my advisor and committee chair, Dr. James E. Groccia, who provided mentorship, with the perfect combination of independence and direction throughout my entire program, starting from selecting the topic to finalizing the dissertation. Dr. Groccia served as a role model who “practices what he preaches” and I am truly thankful for the many opportunities and the significant learning experiences he made available for me. His continuous support and critical insights helped focus and significantly improve my research as well as my teaching skills.

I was truly blessed and privileged to have Dr. William Buskist as a member in my committee. Dr. Buskist, an expert in excellent teaching, was a true friend, and a continuous source of inspiration to me even long before starting my Ph.D. I really appreciate all his guidance, honest advices and support throughout my program.

I would like to thank Dr. James Witte (my committee member), whom I leaned so much from through personal contact and classroom experiences in his courses that I truly enjoyed. His guidance, continuous support and especially his sense of humor are highly appreciated.

I would like to express my special gratitude for my committee member; Dr. Maria Witte who made my graduate school processes flow smoothly and kept me on track. I am truly privileged to have Dr. Witte in my committee. Her advices throughout my program were very helpful.

I especially thank Dr. Gisela Buschle-diller, the University reader of my dissertation. Dr. Buschle-diller's hard work was inspirational and motivational to me. Working closely with her at the Biggio Center was a rich learning experience that I truly appreciate. Her insightful comments guided me in many places in the dissertation.

I would like to thank and acknowledge all faculty and staff member at the Biggio Center, especially Dr. S. Raj Chaudhury, Dr. Stacey Nickson, Ms. Amy Vaughan and my office mate Dr. Chenzi Wang. They all have proven to be wonderful coworkers and colleagues and they made my work at the Biggio Center an amazingly enjoyable experience.

Last but not the least; I would like most of all to thank my wonderful family for their patience and tolerance during the entire time and especially at the stress times.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	ii
Acknowledgments .....	iv
List of Tables .....	x
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	4
Purpose of the Study .....	5
Research Questions .....	5
Significant of the Study .....	6
Research Limitations .....	7
Chapter 2: Literature Review .....	9
Purpose of the Study .....	9
Research Questions .....	9
1-Foreign-Educated Faculty .....	9
History of Faculty Diversity in American Universities .....	9
Statistics about Foreign-Born Faculty in the US .....	10
The Status of Foreign-Born on US Campuses .....	12
- Contributions of Foreign-Educated Faculty .....	13
- Challenges for Foreign-Educated Faculty .....	16
2-Teaching Excellence .....	18

Higher Education in the US .....	18
Defining Effective Teaching/Teacher .....	20
Characteristics of Effective Teaching/Teacher .....	20
Defining Excellent Teaching .....	23
Master Teachers .....	27
Perceptive of Teaching Excellence Compared among Different Groups .....	30
Importance of Active Learning in Excellent Teaching .....	32
Measuring Teaching Effectiveness .....	35
Conclusion .....	38
Chapter 3: Methods .....	39
Introduction .....	39
Research Questions .....	40
Design and Instrumentation .....	40
The Instrument .....	41
The Teacher Behavior Checklist .....	41
Participants .....	42
Procedures and Data Collection .....	43
Data Analysis .....	45
The Reliability and Validity .....	47
Limitations of the Method .....	47
Summary .....	48
Chapter 4: Results .....	49
Research Questions .....	49

Sample Demographic Results .....	49
Data Analysis .....	52
Answering Research Question One .....	52
Answering Research Question Two .....	57
Gender Effect .....	57
Discipline Effect .....	63
Effect of Prior Graduate Developmental Program .....	69
Academic Rank Effect .....	75
Effect of Teaching Experience .....	81
Summary of Results .....	86
Chapter 5 Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Implications .....	89
Summary of the Study .....	89
Answering Research Question One .....	90
Answering Research Question Two .....	93
Gender Effect .....	93
Discipline Effect .....	95
Effect of Prior Graduate Developmental Program .....	97
Academic Rank Effect .....	98
Effect of Teaching Experience .....	100
Conclusion .....	102
Limitations .....	104
Implications for Practice .....	104
Contributions to the Literature.....	104



Implications for Administrators in Academic Institutions/ Teaching Centers ....	105
Recommendations for Future Research .....	106
Summary .....	107
References .....	109
Appendix A: IRB Approval Form .....	121
Appendix B: A Participant Information Letter .....	123
Appendix C: Teacher Behavior Checklist Online Survey .....	126

## List of Tables

Table 4.1. Respondents Demographic Statistics .....	51
Table 4.2. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- educated vs. foreign- educated faculty .....	54
Table 4.3. Rankings and percentages of top 10 teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty. ....	55
Table 4.4. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between male and female faculty.....	59
Table 4.5. Comparison of mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- vs foreign-educated faculty within gender. ....	60
Table 4.6. Rankings and percentages of top eight teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty within gender. ....	61
Table 4.7. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between STEM vs social sciences faculty. ....	64
Table 4.8. Comparison of mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- vs foreign-educated faculty within disciplines (STEM vs Social sciences).....	66
Table 4.9. Rankings and percentages of top eight teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty within discipline (STEM vs Social sciences) .....	67
Table 4.10. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between faculty who participated in prior graduate programs (e.g. PFF) and Faculty who did not. ....	70
Table 4.11. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities within prior graduate preparation.. ....	72
Table 4.12: Rankings and percentages of top nine teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty prior graduate preparation.....	73

Table 4.13. Comparison of mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities among different academic ranks (professor, associate, assistant and other) .....	77
Table 4.14. Comparison of mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- vs foreign-educated faculty within academic ranks of faculty (professor, associate, assistant and other) .....	79
Table 4.15. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities among three levels of faculty teaching experience .....	82
Table 4.16. Comparison of mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- vs foreign-educated faculty within three different levels of teaching experience.....	84

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

A high percentage of elite international students seek graduate degrees in English-speaking countries and the majority targets the United States (Spring, 2008). The number of international students studying at colleges and universities in the United States has risen dramatically during the past few decades. Although declined after 9/11, the number of international students has significantly increased in the last few years (Institute of International Education, 2011). Many international graduate students tend to seek faculty jobs in the United States after their graduation or after spending one or more years in post-doctoral positions (Altbach, 2006).

The American professoriate has become more diverse as more international faculty have joined the academy. The terms “international faculty,” “foreign-born faculty,” and “foreign-educated” refer to the same population of faculty who are not native U.S. citizens, and who were born and educated during their secondary and undergraduate years primarily outside the United States (Theobald, 2007).

The number of foreign-educated faculty is rapidly increasing in the US. Thirty three percent (33%) of all doctoral recipients in 2006 were non-U.S. citizen on temporary visas who earned doctoral degrees and then stayed in the U.S. (Dongbin, Wolf-Wendel, & Twombly, 2011). More than 126,000 international scholars were teaching or doing research in the US universities according to The Institute of International Education report for 2007-2008 academic year (Li, Wall, Loy, & Schoonaert, 2012). The steadily rising presence of non-U.S. citizens on

temporary visas who earn doctoral degrees and then stay in the U.S. suggests that the number and proportion of foreign-educated faculty may continue to increase (Hoffer, Hess, Welch, & Williams, 2006; Manrique & Manrique, 1999).

Foreign-educated faculty in US universities face challenges different from those of their domestic counterparts. Theobald (2007) stated that they interact with institutions, department colleagues and students somewhat differently. Evidence, whether anecdotal or from statistical reports in the American higher education, about the barriers for international scholars highlights the situation of foreign-educated faculty and students on US campuses (Theobald, 2007).

Most post-doctoral positions sought by foreign graduate students, before entering the professoriate, focus mainly on conducting disciplinary research with little or no attention to teaching or teaching skills. In reality however, when an international graduate student or postdoc secures a faculty job, a major part of his/her appointment will be to teach undergraduate or post graduate courses. Although they excel in research, foreign-educated faculty often struggle with their teaching obligations (Mamiseishvili, 2011).

Teaching in the American classrooms is one of the major challenges for foreign-educated faculty. It can be a very difficult, or even a dreadful experience, for foreign-educated faculty, and particularly for those who never taught a course before. This could be attributed to unfamiliarity with both general culture and US higher education system and US academic institutions culture (Thomas & Johnson, 2004). Cultural differences can be very influential in impacting the quality of teaching. Teaching in American classroom requires deep understanding of the American culture and mastery of the language, without which communication between instructor and students will be hindered and at some points, obstructed.

Differences in educational practices can lead to misunderstandings between faculty members and students (Collins, 2008). Many foreign-educated faculty come from countries where standards for evaluating teaching are predicated mainly on the ability to transfer information to students through teacher talk and lecture. However, in today's highly competitive academic world, given what we know about human learning (Groccia, & Hunter, 2012), this is no longer an adequate standard by which teachers may be evaluated. This is mainly because teaching excellence is becoming a basic demand in higher education and faculty members are expected to deliver high-standard education to college students (Devlin & Samarawickrema, 2010).

The concept of effective/excellent teaching is not static and it changes over time due to forces from within and outside the universities. As a consequence, our understanding of effective teaching must continually evolve to respond to the contexts in which learning and teaching take place. Understanding the qualities of effective teaching is important to ensure the quality of university teaching and learning (Devlin & Samarawickrema, 2010). In addition, sharing that understanding of excellent teaching among faculty and administrator establishes the basis for quality education.

Students need to learn more skills such as critical thinking and problem solving and not just memorization of information for the test, as done in straight lecture method (Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Chaudhury, 2011). Higher education has received much criticism recently and public dissatisfaction was mainly due to increased emphasis on research and publication at the expense of student academic welfare (Groccia & Buskist, 2011). Due to this high demand for excellent teaching, exploration of the factors that contribute to excellence in teaching has attracted researchers and several studies have attempted to define effective teaching or excellent teaching and its components (Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley, & Saville, 2002; Dunkin,

1995; Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Keeley, Christopher, & Buskist, 2012; Keeley, Smith, & Buskist, 2006; Revell & Wainwright, 2009). Although researchers have suggested different factors that contribute to teaching excellence, common elements and qualities are shared amongst them. Many of the qualities of excellent teachers do not come naturally to instructors at the college level and these qualities need to be acquired through extensive practice, constructive feedback from both students and peers, and critical personal reflection. Reflection generates desirable cognitive, metacognitive, and affective outcomes that help teachers improve the quality of practice, identify methods for exploring teaching and learning mechanisms and facilitate change (Baird, Fensham, Gunstone, & White, 1991; Collins 1990). Reflection is a key part of teacher growth and should become a part of every teacher's career.

While international graduate students have been the subject for many studies (Ty & Alkarzon, 2013), little research has been conducted on the experiences of international faculty. Little is known about their specific perceptions of teaching or the effect of their past cultural background on teaching in the United States. Increasing demands for high-quality education and culture differences are but some of the factors that make it more difficult for foreign-educated faculty in the American classroom.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Foreign-educated faculty may have different perceptions of excellent teaching which may affect their teaching and student learning. Although many new faculty participate in teaching and learning centers activities to support new, learner-centered instructional practice, perceptions about excellent teaching developed through prior learning and teaching in foreign institutions can be sometimes more pervasive among foreign-educated faculty. Understanding faculty's

perceptions and views of teaching excellence may help facilitate and improve professional development and processes for foreign-educated faculty members.

### **Purpose of the Study**

This study aimed to identify key views of foreign-educated faculty who teach in American universities on what constitutes excellence in teaching in general and also by looking at the impact of demographic information. Demographic information included: country where undergraduate and post graduate education were received, participation in any graduate developmental programs (such as Preparing Future Faculty; PFF or Graduate Teaching Assistant Fellows Program; GTAP), gender, academic rank, years of teaching experience and discipline. This study employed survey data collected from both native-born American faculty (who received their undergraduate education in the USA) and foreign-educated faculty from 14 different American universities in the southern US. This study was conducted during spring 2014 and faculty were asked to complete an on-line survey, ranking the top 10 of 28 teacher qualities for excellent teaching from their own perspectives (Buskist et al., 2002).

### **Research Questions:**

The purpose of this study was to answer the following questions:

- 1- What are the perceptions of teaching excellence among foreign-educated faculty who teach in US universities and how do those perceptions differ from native US-educated faculty?
- 2- Do foreign-educated and US-educated faculty demographic characteristics (i.e. gender, discipline, academic rank, attending faculty preparation programs and years of experience in teaching) have an influence on perceived teaching excellence?



## **Significance of the Study**

Through understanding of how foreign-educated faculty view teaching excellence we can get a clearer picture of what they believe contributes most to instructional quality. Results of this research can be disseminated to university administrators to help them better consider specialized supporting programs for new faculty, especially those of foreign-origin during their first years in the professoriate. This information can also be useful for teaching and learning centers in designing special programs focusing on excellent teaching for new faculty.

The vast majority of newly hired faculty (whether international or native) in the US are often not prepared by doctoral or terminal degree granting institutions for faculty roles, which include teaching (Puri, Graves, Lowenstein, & Hsu, 2012). Participating in faculty development programs is critical and valuable in reducing the time required for faculty to develop as fully functioning members of the academic team (Fink, 1992). In addition, faculty development programs provide an opportunity to enhance faculty recruitment and retention (Boice, 1992; Fink, 1992; Lindbeck & Darnell, 2008). Therefore, the results of this research may provide valuable information concerning the importance of teaching excellence developmental programs for new faculty.

In addition, survey results can be enlightening to many faculty about the qualities of excellent teaching and help them to identify specific ways to modify and improve their own teaching. The list of 28 teacher qualities was compiled from data collected from both students and faculty on what constitute excellence teaching (Buskist et al., 2002). Therefore, it will be very relevant to participants in this survey and can inspire them about the broader picture of excellent teaching.

Although the survey instrument used in the current study was based upon what has previously been shown to be important to university students, it has yet to be used in a large-scale study where data are collected from several universities at the same time. Therefore, the current study would contribute to the literature by expanding our knowledge of foreign- vs native-educated faculty's views of excellent teaching.

### **Research Limitations**

Because this study was conducted in several universities in the southern US with the focus on foreign-educated faculty, there might be a risk of not getting enough participants. When it comes to any sort of perceived evaluation of teaching, faculty may be hesitant to get involved.

The Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC; Buskist et al., 2002) and the survey method may present some limitations in this study. The use of this online survey involved moving and sorting 10 of the 28 qualities of excellent teaching to the top of the list, based on how important each quality for achieving excellence in teaching is perceived. This method of holding, and moving items is different from the regular ranking method using the Likert scale, and therefore it could represent a limitation of how many participants can do this process without difficulty.

Also the survey does not allow participants to explore or identify other elements of teaching excellence or add any additional qualities with an open-ended type of questions. However, because the survey has been implemented successfully in several studies before, this limitation is considered minimal. Several studies have already been built and interpreted results based on the TBC (Keeley, Furr, & Buskist, 2010; Keeley et al., 2006; Keeley, Christopher & Buskist, 2012; O'Meara, 2007). Therefore it is critical to use the instrument as is, without change in order to take advantage of results and conclusions of those studies. In addition, because the TBC is a 28- item limited instrument and because it has been found to be reliable,

valid and psychometrically sound (Keely et al., 2006), introducing modifications to it would be burdensome, as this would require major testing for a number of validity and reliability issues that are beyond the scope of the current study.

## CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

### **Purpose of the Study**

This study aimed to identify key views of foreign-educated faculty who teach in American universities on what constitute excellence in teaching in general and also by looking at the impact of demographic information. Demographic information included: country where undergraduate and post graduate education were received, participation in any graduate developmental programs (such as Preparing Future Faculty; PFF or Graduate Teaching Assistant Fellows Program; GTAP), gender, academic rank, years of teaching experience and discipline.

### **Research Questions:**

The purpose of this study is to answer the following questions:

- 1- 1- What are the perceptions of teaching excellence among foreign-educated faculty who teach in US universities and how do those perceptions differ from native US-educated faculty?
- 2- 2- Do foreign-educated and US-educated faculty demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, discipline, academic rank, attending faculty preparation programs and years of experience in teaching) have an influence on perceived teaching excellence?

### **1-Foreign-Educated Faculty**

#### **History of Faculty Diversity in American Universities**

From a historical point of view, legislation has played a major role on the composition of the immigrant populations. The quota system in 1920s was restrictive and favored Western

Europe or Western hemisphere immigrants (Hollmann, 1993). The immigration act of 1965 abrogated that quota system and was further supported by legislation in 1986 and 1990 (Marvasti, 2005). As a result, the population from Latin America alone increased to 51 % (14.5 million) and from Asia to 25.5 % of the total immigrants in 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001). This allowed more immigration of “highly skilled” workers, especially those with doctorates (Johnson, 2006).

Foreign-educated faculty are attracted to the USA which can offer higher standards and greater degree of academic freedom compared to institutions in their home countries (Bradford, 1990). The continued evolution of cultural diversity in America is significantly affected by the role that universities play in integrating foreign-educated faculty (Manrique & Manrique, 1999). However, the dynamics of integrating this population into the university is not well-understood (Basti, 1996; Liu, 2001).

Many factors have led to the increase in number of foreign-educated faculty in the US academia. These included; increasing efforts to internationalize American colleges and universities, and increased population of foreign Ph.D. graduates (Altbach, 2005, 2006; De Wit, 2002; Hser, 2005; Mamiseishvili, 2011; Sheppard, 2004).

### **Statistics about Foreign-Born Faculty in the US**

The foreign-born population in the US has grown from 9.6 million in 1970, to 33.6 million according to the US census in 2010. Twenty seven (27%) or 9.1 million of the 33.6 million, of foreign-born population aged 25 and older, had a bachelor’s degree or higher in 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

The number of international students studying at colleges and universities in the United States has risen dramatically during the past few decades. After experiencing a decline after 9/11,

the number of international students has significantly increased in the last few years (Institute of International Education, 2011). International students enrollments in 2010 were reported to have increased by 52 % in responding universities (Open Doors: International Student Enrollment, 2010).

Most international students come to enroll in the graduate school and upon graduation and post-doctoral positions; they tend to seek faculty jobs in the United States (Altbach, 2006). Most post-doctoral positions focus mainly on conducting research in the area of interest with little attention to teaching or teaching skills. The percentage of international students who received their Ph.D. in the US increased from 11 % in 1975 to 31 % in 2005 (Hoffer, Hess, Welch, & Williams, 2006).

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010) expected a significant growth of hiring in colleges and universities in near future, with a proportion of that from foreign-educated faculty. An increase from nine (9%) in 1990 to 23 % in 2003 was observed in full-time minority professors (including foreign-educated) in degree-granting institutions (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). As a result, a relative increase in the proportion of foreign-educated faculty is also expected.

Thirty three (33 %) of all bachelor's degree holders were in engineering fields, 27 % in computers, mathematics, and statistics, 24 % in physical sciences, and 17 % in biological, agricultural, and environmental sciences (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Similarly, foreign-educated faculty are most concentrated in STEM disciplines (Science, technology, engineering and Math), accounting for 20.9 % of faculty in these fields (35 % of faculty in engineering and 39 % in computer science) and they make one-third of the new hires in those STEM fields (Kim, Wolf-Wendel & Twombly, 2011). However, the number of those who worked in higher

education can only be underreported, especially outside STEM disciplines. The Institute of International Education reported 126,123 international scholars (or 24 % of faculty in colleges and universities) were in teaching or research jobs in the US universities during the 2007-2008 academic year (Li et al., 2012).

Seven major demographic categories are often used in describing foreign- educated faculty (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008): White, Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, Unknown race/ethnicity, and non-resident aliens. Those are different from the traditional classification of minority faculty (Hispanic, Black non-Hispanic, Asian and Pacific Islander, American Indian and Alaska Native, and nonresident alien). There were 31,222 non-resident faculty members in U.S. degree-granting institutions in 2007, representing 4.4 % of the 703,463 faculty (National Center for Education Statistics, 2008). In addition, there is a disproportional nature in the distribution of those foreign-educated faculty, with the majority are from Asia. According to Open Doors (2008), the highest numbers of international scholars come from China (22 %), followed by India (9.4 %), South Korea (9.3 %), Japan (5.4 %), Germany (5 %), and Canada (4.5 %).

### **The Status of Foreign-Born on US Campuses**

American universities have become popular destination for many students and faculty from all around the globe (Spring, 2008; Trice, 2003). The issue of diversity in the American campuses is becoming more important than ever before (Altbach, 2006). The steady increase in the number of foreign-educated faculty suggests that their proportion may continue to increase (Manrique & Manrique, 1999). Therefore, it is important for university administrators to be aware of the number of foreign-educated faculty on campus and assess their training needs. Foote, Li, Monk and Theobald (2008) found that foreign-educated faculty were depicted as

vulnerable group often ignored by on-campus support and the challenges they are facing are seldom addressed (e.g. cultural and legal issue they deal with on daily basis).

Thus, understanding the work life and professional experience of foreign-educated faculty is becoming more important for university administrators and education policy makers (Altbach & Knight, 2007). There is an increasing likelihood that retiring faculty members will be replaced by minority faculty (especially women) and/or foreign-educated scholars (Collins, 2008; Rusch, 2004).

The increase in number of foreign-educated faculty will require more focus from universities administrators on issues related to those faculty, not only from professional but also from personal perspectives. Personal perspectives of foreign-educated faculty may include, feeling isolated or getting adapted to the culture and obtaining the green card. The impact of increased internationalization of US universities on academic institutions, other faculty and students need to be emphasized. This emphasis would be mainly because this changing landscape of faculty members will have direct short- and long-term effects on all parties involved (Khrabrova, 2011).

### **Contributions of Foreign-Educated Faculty**

The United States Higher Education system attracts faculty from all over the world. American higher education has continuously benefited from the talents of scientists educated outside the United States and foreign countries have long provided American higher education with substantial numbers of highly qualified academics (Lee, 2004).

Foreign-educated faculty occupy a special niche in the American four-year colleges, especially in the areas of pure and applied sciences (Lin, Pearce, and Wang, 2009). US science and knowledge production is considerably advanced by the exceptional contributions of foreign-



educated faculty. Foreign-educated scholars represent 19.2 % of the members of the National Academy of Engineering (NAE) and 23.8 % of those of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS; Stephan & Levin, 2001). The quality of immigrant scientists was summarized by Stephan and Levin (2001) as follows:

...Foreign-born scientist and engineers who come to the US to receive training, especially at the doctoral or post-doctoral level, are typically among the most able of their contemporaries. Often they passed through two screens: they have been educated at the best institutions in their countries, withstanding intense competition for the limited number of slots available, and they have competed with the best applicants from many countries, including those from the U.S., before being selected for further training in the US (p.# 65).

Theobald (2007) reviewed the situation of international faculty in the United States highlighting departmental and institutional concerns as articulated by thirty geography department chairs and ten academic deans in individual interviews in different public and private institutions. Administrators at all levels asserted that foreign-educated faculty support diversity goals. Foreign-educated faculty members contribute to teaching and research missions of the institution, are regularly considered for open positions, and are treated no differently than other faculty members. Immigrants bring with them two characteristics — cognitive diversity and determination to succeed — that help them make significant contributions to their new environment (Khrabrova, 2011).

The contributions of foreign-educated scholars to campus diversity, scientific improvement and as well as increasing awareness of global contexts cannot be understated (Altbach, 2005, 2006; Horn, Hendel, & Fry, 2007; Mamiseishvili, 2011; Mamiseishvili & Rosser, 2010; NAFSA 2006; Stromquist, 2007). Foreign-educated scholars' involvement in research and publications is well-observed (Li et al., 2012). However, prejudicial stereotypes which form the common beliefs about foreign-educated faculty's inferior ability to fulfill tasks and the perception about their effectiveness in teaching or ability to be a role model may mask these contributions (Marvasti, 2005). Foreign-educated faculty are less engaged in teaching and less satisfied with their jobs compared to American faculty (Corley & Sabharwal, 2007; Mamiseishvili, 2010; Marvasti, 2005; Wells, Seifert, Park, Reed, & Umbach, 2007). Foreign-academic scientists and engineers are more productive, yet less paid than their US-educated peers.

Foreign-educated faculty enrich the cultural diversity on American campuses and increase the sense of appreciation of own and others culture (Stohl, 2007). In addition, increased population of foreign-educated faculty encourages domestic faculty to be more productive (Seifert & Umbach, 2008). The productivity of foreign faculty members in research articles and books is undeniable. In a study of 750 foreign faculty (Quazi, Quddus, Debnath, & Tandon, 2004) found that the 35 % of them have published more than 20 referred articles, books or written chapters in books.

Faculty in U.S. institutions significantly benefit from the methods of research and skill brought by foreign-educated visiting scholars that helps broaden US faculty perspectives (Gahungu, 2011). Foreign-educated faculty can affect US campuses in three areas; 1) teaching and mentoring students which consequently affect the leaders of future generations, 2)

establishing research partnerships with their home institutions and bringing their own perspectives into their research and 3) sharing their own experiences with the community inside and outside the university (O'Hara, 2009; Gahungu, 2011).

### **Challenges for Foreign-Educated Faculty**

Recent research (Collins, 2008) seems to indicate that foreign-educated scholars often have needs and concerns (whether inside or outside the classrooms) different from those of their domestic counterparts. Theobald (2007) stated that they interact with institutions, department colleagues, and students somewhat differently. Some evidence, whether anecdotal or from statistical reports in American higher education about the barriers for foreign-born scholars, have drawn attention to the situation of foreign-educated faculty (Theobald, 2007).

Foreign-educated share common challenges with faculty from minority groups. Racial discrimination and bias (Peterson, Friedman, Ash, Franco, & Carr, 2004) is common. Thirty eight (38%) of the respondents (in a study of 2400 foreign-educated faculty from non-European origin in 1993-1994) felt they had been discriminated against in the work place either by their colleagues or by administrators (Mamiseishvili, 2010). Other challenges included the felt need for more time and effort to secure funding for research (Antonio, 2002); devaluation of their scholarship quality by their peers (Fenelon, 2003; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001; Turner, Myers, & Creswell, 1999), lack of mentors who can help them advance their career (Butner, Burley, & Marbley, 2000; Laden & Hagedorn, 2000; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001; Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, and Bonous-Hammarth, 2000), teaching 1.5 more hours per week than their peers (Allen et al., 2000) and ultimately facing more difficulty in getting tenured (Smith, 2000).

Collins (2008) found that as the foreign-educated faculty reflected on the most challenging or important aspects of their situation, their responses fell into three categories: (1)

obtaining the 'Green Card' was reported by 28 of the 30 faculty respondents (93 %); (2) addressing cultural differences was noted by 26 respondents (87%); and (3) coping with loneliness by 19 respondents (63 %). Foreign-educated faculty reported that they come to the US with different views and standards for familial relationships, religious beliefs, expectations and social and cultural conventions. These different cultural standards reflect on their behaviors and can become matters of contention.

Challenges faced by foreign-educated faculty may affect their lives and especially their teaching (Berget, Reynolds, Ricci, Quinn, Mawson, Payton, & Thomas, 2010). Their success in the first few years of their appointment as faculty members is greatly influenced by their success as researchers and with increasing importance, as teachers. Although they excel in research, foreign-educated faculty often struggle with their teaching obligations (Mamiseishvili, 2011).

Little is known about foreign-educated faculty's specific perceptions about teaching or cultural effect on teaching in higher education institutions in the United States. Being born in a different culture, and unfamiliarity with the US higher education system and US academic institutional culture (Thomas & Johnson, 2004), both make it difficult to relate to students in classrooms (Collins, 2008). Cultural differences encountered during the teaching and learning process can result in misunderstandings between instructors and students and negative reactions of students to the accent of foreign-educated instructors (Collins, 2008).

The strongest perception about foreign-educated faculty is that their linguistic problems contribute to ineffective teaching. The perception about their ineffectiveness in teaching might be also rooted in the perceptions of language difficulties of foreign-born teaching assistants (TAs) which is because foreign educated-faculty are usually former foreign TAs (Mavasti, 2005).

Although there is research that shows that foreign-educated instructors may have a negative effect on undergraduate performance (Borjas, 2000), instructor's English accent is not, in most cases, the problem. However, undergraduate students not being accustomed to the accent or unwillingness to adjust to that accent is usually the cause of the problem (Alberts, 2008). Foreign-educated faculty generally receive poor marks on communication skills and teaching skills (although they get high scores on knowledge and social skills). Even those foreign-educated instructors with excellent English still received many complaints from American students (Clayton, 2000). On the other hand, foreign-educated faculty were found to be effective in teaching by older (senior) students, international students, and students with a high grade point average (GPA) (Neves & Sanyal, 1991).

In short, language accent; challenges from students; difficulty balancing teaching, scholarship, and service; lack of support; racism; prejudice; and bias are among the challenges that face foreign-educated faculty (Li et al., 2013). Teaching in American classrooms can be a challenging experience for any faculty member. If all the above challenges faced by foreign-educated faculty, especially in their first years in the professoriate, were added to regular difficulties that are experienced by new faculty in general, we can only but imagine a very difficult situation.

## **2-Teaching Excellence**

### **Higher Education in the US**

Society relies on and expects college graduates to be prepared by highly competent faculty so they can make significant positive contributions to that society or beyond. The lack of a state-run or centrally accredited system in the US higher education is sometimes looked at as strong point of that system; however, this system is not problem-free. It comes with lists of

accusations, among which is the poor performance in teaching and learning (Theobald, 2007). The individual faculty member in any traditional college or university is the primary pillar of the educational system, the principal means of knowledge delivery, and the main guarantor of academic quality. However, with the rapid advances of information technology (e.g. email, internet, distance learning, and digital media), these assumptions are being challenged. Increased access for higher education for individuals from a wide range of socioeconomic background makes the teaching job of any faculty, and especially foreign-born faculty, even more difficult. In addition, as schools have entered into the new millennium, there is a growing pressure to deliver high quality education to students (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 2005).

Teachers are exposed to continuous changes in their academic lives in the process of educational change or innovation (Wan, 2011). Although good teaching does not receive enough recognition compared to research in general, teaching excellence is becoming more of a demand in higher education. Interest in factors that contribute to excellence in teaching has always attracted researchers. Several studies have attempted to define and pinpoint the attributes of effective and excellent teaching (for example: Buskist et al., 2002; Keeley et al., 2006; Revell & Wainwright, 2009).

Devlin and Samarawickrema (2010) examined the criteria of effective teaching in Australian higher education. They indicated that the context of effective teaching is subject to continuous and multiple changes imposed by forces from within and outside universities. Therefore, our understanding of competent, professional, and effective teaching must continually evolve to reflect and continually respond to the contexts in which learning and teaching take place. The authors argued that shared understanding of effective teaching is important to ensure the quality of university teaching and learning. They also argued that, due to massive and

ongoing change in higher education, it is time for a renewal of some of the current criteria and collective understanding of effective teaching.

### **Defining Effective Teaching/Teacher**

Although there are many definitions of an effective teacher, an exact definition is debatable in the teaching literature (Kukla-Acevedo, 2008). Papanastasiou (1999) emphasized “that no single teacher attribute or characteristic is adequate to define an effective teacher” (p. 6). Some definitions included “all the instructor behaviors that help students learn” (Cashin, 1989, p.4); or “teaching that fosters student learning” (Wankat, 2002, p. # 4); “Obviously, the definition involves someone who can increase student knowledge, but it goes beyond this in defining an effective teacher.” (Clark, 1993, p. #10). Swank, Taylor, Brady, and Frieberg (1989) considered teacher effectiveness as increasing academic questions and decreasing lecture.

### **Characteristics of Effective Teaching/Teacher**

Attributes of effective instructors have been discussed in the literature for many years (Oesch, 2005). Some researchers focused on addressing ineffective attributes of teaching which impede student learning and significantly reduce hope of reaching effectiveness. Arrogance, dullness, rigidity, insensitivity, self-indulgence, vanity, and hypocrisy were stated as the seven deadly sins of teaching (Eble, 1983). On the contrary, modesty, use of humor, showing care for student and respecting others’ point of view were attributes that are correlated to highest students rating for instructors (Murray, 1985).

As part of a teacher assessment project, Collins (1990) was able to determine five criteria for an effective teacher that included his/her commitment to students and learning, knowledge about the subject matter, management of students, reflection on own practice, and participation in a learning community. Qualities of effective teaching or teachers extracted from a review

study by Wotruba and Wright (1975) highlighted: (a) communication skills, (b) favorable attitudes, (c) knowledge of subject, (d) good organizational skills, (e) enthusiasm, (f) fairness, (g) flexibility, (h) encouraging to students, and (i) providing interesting lectures.

Five components for highly effective teaching and learning have been identified (Kentucky Department of Education, 2013): learning climate, classroom assessment and reflection, instructional rigor and student engagement, instructional relevance and knowledge of content.

According to Miller (as quoted in Seldin, 1999, p. 156):

Effective teachers personify enthusiasm for their students, their area of competence, and life itself. They know their subject, can explain it clearly, and are willing to do so--in or out of class... Class periods are interesting and, at times, alive with excitement. They approach their area of competence and their students with integrity that is neither stiff nor pompous, and their attitude and demeanor are more caught than taught.

Similarly, Hativa, Barak, and Simhi (2001) referred to enthusiasm, engaging, motivating and stimulating students, clarity, organization, establishing rapport with students, and providing comfortable learning atmosphere as effective practices of teaching. They described exemplary teachers as follows:

Exemplary teachers are highly organized, plan their lessons carefully, set unambiguous goals, and have high expectations of their students. They give students regular feedback regarding their progress in the course, make specific remediation recommendations, and assume a major responsibility for student outcomes. (p.701)



According to Seldin (1999), effective teachers have the following attributes: 1) respect and care for students, 2) use active student learning, 3) use different instructional modes, 4) provide frequent and prompt feedback to students on their performance, 5) offer relevant and practical real-world examples, 6) draw inferences from models and use analogies, 7) provide clear expectations for assignments, 8) create a conducive class environment which is comfortable for students; 9) communicate to the level of their students, 10) present themselves in class as "real people," 11) assess and improve their teaching through the use of feedback from students and others too and 12) consistently reflect on their own performance in classroom for continues improvement.

Faranda and Clarke (2004) also found five major categories (with subcategories) of effective teaching from students' perspective: (1) rapport (approachability, accessibility, personality, empathy), (2) delivery (communication, personal style, pedagogy), (3) fairness (performance evaluation, assignments), (4) knowledge/credibility (expertise, experience, intelligence), and (5) organization/ preparation (clarity, thoroughness, instructional materials).

Similar characteristics for teachers' effectiveness included being student-centered, enthusiastic about teaching, knowledgeable on the subject matter, professional, ethical, competent and effective in classroom management (Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, & James, 2002). Similar themes were reported with other additional attributes such as availability and accessibility, promoting a challenging learning context, organization of course content, incorporating classroom discussions, encouraging students to ask questions, and using relevant examples (Balam, 2006).

Young and Shaw (1999) investigated multiple dimensions of teaching effectiveness with 912 college students including undergraduate and graduate levels in 31 courses in different

disciplines and found that “value of interest, motivating students to do their best, comfortable learning atmosphere, course organization, effective communication, concern for student learning, and genuine respect for students were highly related to the criterion of teacher effectiveness” (p. # 682).

Some studies showed that qualities of effective teaching can be universal; however, culture or gender may influence the perception of effective teaching. Alshare and Miller (2009) attempted to explore students’ perceptions of importance of instructor traits in three countries, United States, Jordan, and Chile, using a survey questionnaire. In addition, the survey requested information about perceptions of importance of forty-five traits of instructors. Thirty four traits were considered by students to be important to very important. These traits could be classified into five main categories: traits related to instructor 1) personality, 2) communication skills, 3) style of class management and evaluation of student performance, 4) qualification and credentials, and 5) teaching style. Among the demographic factors, gender was the most significant factor that influenced student responses, especially for the American and Jordanian students. Although there were cultural differences among students from the three countries on the perceptions of effective teaching, they agreed that to be respectful of students, approachable in and out of class, and clear as well as concise in explanations of course materials were the most important traits.

### **Defining Excellent Teaching**

Although teaching excellence goes beyond teaching effectiveness (Kreber, 2002), differentiating between effectiveness and excellence in teaching is not easy to recognize due to the overlap of the two. The two terms have been interchangeably in the literature and therefore it will be difficult to make that distinction. However, one description for excellent teaching was

provided by Sorason, Davidson, and Blatt (1982) who stated that excellence is the ability to adapt teaching behaviors and techniques to the capabilities of students. Excellent teachers are those who “had achieved remarkable success in helping their students learn in ways that made a sustained, substantial, and positive influence on how those students think , act , and fell..... They produced important educational results” (Bain, 2004, p. 5).

A definition of teaching excellence involved the requirement for scholarly activities that involved “sound knowledge of one’s discipline as well as a good understanding of how students grow within, and perhaps even beyond, the discipline” (Kreber 2002, p. 9). Active experimentation and continuous reflection on the teaching experience is source of knowledge on how to teach for excellent teachers (Mentkowski & associates, 2000).

From a survey study that requested directors of teaching centers around the US to provide a definition of teaching excellence, Buskist (in preparation) created a composite definition for excellent teaching: “Excellent teaching is any form of instruction based on empirically supported or otherwise demonstrably effective pedagogy that produces meaningful, significant, transferable, and enjoyable student learning experiences.”

Many studies have attempted to identify the attributes of excellent teaching or teachers. Jowaisas (2004) stated that attributes of excellent teachers most frequently found by researchers included:

1. treats students as individuals within the classroom structure
2. involves students in the learning process
3. encourages students
4. uses a variety of teaching strategies to add interest
5. models the learning behavior expected of students

6. challenges students in the classroom
7. creates a positive classroom environment

The findings of Faranda and Clarke (2004) of students' perspectives of excellent teaching were similar to those reported by Barnes, Engelland, Matherine, Martin, Orgeron, Ring, and Williams (2008) from faculty perspective. The qualities of excellent teaching were combined into two categories. These included teaching readiness (preparedness, evaluation, and professionalism), and teaching excellence (rapport, enthusiasm, delivery, and excellence). Similarly, enthusiasm; clarity of presentation; preparation and organization; stimulation of interest and thinking about the subject matter; and knowledge of the subject matter were five attributes reported by Sherman, Armisted, Fowler, Barksdale, and Reif (1987) as defining characteristics of excellent teaching.

In a similar study about perceptions of the best college course using a questionnaire method, Levy and Peters (2002), assessed the perception of 105 undergraduate psychology students for best college courses across three domains (the course, the professor, and the student's role). For the course domain, the researchers found that the best courses are the ones that provided comfortable learning environment, interesting content and guiding reviews before exams. For the professor domain, researchers reported that best professor had the following qualities "sense of humor, being excited about the material, being entertaining, having a caring attitude, using a variety of teaching techniques, communicating well, being not arrogant, being fair, being approachable, and making students feel smart" (p. #47). For the third domain (the student's role), best courses were the ones that students received the grade they reported they deserved.

In first phase in a 2-phase study conducted by Cravens (1996) at Saint Louis Community College, 497 students were asked in a questionnaire to list methods and behaviors that they felt associated with teaching excellence and top 20 most frequent characteristics of teaching excellence were determined. In phase two, a second questionnaire was administered to 423 students to give a value score for each of those 20 behaviors. Results showed that the top 5 ranked behaviors were: (1) use of relevant examples, (2) clear emphasis on facts, (3) use of visual aids;, (4) use of humor, and (5) enthusiasm.

Establishing rapport is of one of major attributes of excellent teaching (Keeley et al., 2012). Students are more likely to understand the content of a lecture if the lecturer interacted with them in a way that encouraged involvement, commitment, and interest (Fleming, 2003). When students feel comfort with a teacher it actually may lead to achieving one of the important course outcomes, which is the improved learning and the development of critical thinking skill (Buskist et al., 2002). On the other hand, lack of student participation in class due to fear, would greatly reduce the possibility of learning new information (Schultz & Marchuk, 2006).

Using a 46- closed-ended item survey, Walsh and Maffei (1994) asked 295 students and 116 faculty to assess behaviors contributing to or detracting from the student-faculty relationship. Both faculty and students identified similar behaviors that greatly enhanced the student-faculty relationship. Treating students equally without regard to race or sex, learning individual student names quickly, being patient in explaining things, and displaying a friendly demeanor were emphasized as contributing behaviors. Failing to keep posted office hours, and offering little explanation for grading procedures were among behaviors that greatly detracted from the positive student-faculty relationship.

Building rapport with students is a way for the instructor to communicate respect in the classroom (Rodabaugh, 1996). As a popular statement suggests, “Children do not care how much you know until they know how much you care” (unknown source).

### **Master Teachers**

A master teacher is “an individual who is highly effective as a classroom teacher” (Schaeffer, Epting, Zinn, & Buskist, 2003, p. #134). Buskist et al. (2002) reviewed briefly what is known about master teachers combined from several books. Authors of those books agreed on three qualities of master teaching: knowledge (preparedness, organization and critical thinking), personality (no single personality type but approachable, genuine, humorous, respectful to students, have rapport with students, have passion and enthusiasm ) and classroom management skills (properly dealing with problem student, motivating, using active learning, communicate high expectations and devote time for students). Buskist et al. compared faculty and student ratings for qualities of master teacher in two phases. First, they asked 114 undergraduates to list at least three characteristics that they believed were central to a person being a master teacher. The process produced a list of 47 characteristics that were subsequently presented to another 184 students to select the top three behaviors of master teacher. Comparing the two resulted in a list of 28 qualities and behaviors. In phase two, the list of 28 was given to 916 undergraduate students and 118 faculty at Auburn university. Students and faculty agreed on six of the top 10 qualities and behaviors: (a) realistic expectations/fairness, (b) Knowledgeableness, (c) approachable/personable, (d) respectful, (e) creative/interesting, and (f) enthusiasm.

Based on interviews and class observation of 30 identified master teachers from different disciplines, Buskist (2004) identified 10 common basic principles for their distinguished teaching. Those principles come on top of their other basic attributes of being bright,

knowledgeable, well-organized, highly prepared, well-spoken and tremendously hardworking.

The 10 identified principles of master teachers emphasized that they:

1. focus on thinking processes and problem-solving skills rather than merely facts and figures.
2. keep the content of their courses current.
3. are enthusiastic about their subject matter, teaching, and students..
4. make learning fun, but not necessarily entertaining.
5. are high in self-monitoring.
6. show a genuine concern for their students' academic welfare
7. view teaching as an experimental endeavor that naturally entails risk.
8. use tests for both evaluative and instructional purposes.
9. establish high academic standards.
10. possess a deep sense of humanity and a seemingly boundless capacity for caring about others.

Similar results were found by Barnes et al. (2008), who identified the following attributes: teaching readiness and teaching excellence. Teaching readiness included preparedness, evaluation and professionalism. Teaching excellence included rapport, enthusiasm, delivery, and excellence to reflect the optimal teacher-student relationship. The common theme in their findings is revolving around the interests of the students. Teaching excellence has evolved into more than content and centers around meeting the needs of the students while maintaining high expectations for all students.

Keeley et al. (2012) explored the perception of master teaching among U.S. students in a small 4-year liberal arts college and compared the results with those obtained from Japanese

students attending a small liberal arts college in an attempt to expand current understanding of excellent teaching at a global level. Students from both colleges used the 28-item TBC to rate the extent to which a “master teacher” displays each quality and its attendant behaviors using 1 (never exhibits this quality) to 5 (frequently exhibit this quality). The 28 items were first rank ordered based on their means. Both US and Japanese students largely agreed on 7 of the top 10 teacher qualities: knowledgeable, confident, approachable/personable, enthusiastic, effective communicator, prepared, and good listener. Keeley et al. (2006) provided initial evidence for the soundness of the psychometric properties of this TBC list and that it provides a relatively clean measurement of teacher quality (Keeley et al., 2010). Comparing the above results of Keeley et al. (2012) to Buskist et al. (2002), it was found that students agreed on four of the top 10 qualities (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, respectful and enthusiastic).

Similarly, Oesch (2005) studied students’ perceptions and attitudes towards identifying the best course environments and the qualities of excellent teaching in community college setting using the questionnaire method. Results showed similarity between perceptions of community college students and those previously documented by university students.

Using the TBC, Vulcano (2007) aimed at generalizing students’ perceptions of the qualities and behaviors of perfect instructors and their respective rankings, and offering international support for categories of excellent teaching. He surveyed two samples of Canadian undergraduates regarding their view of perfect instructors. Results showed that the top 10 qualities identified were: (1) knowledgeable, (2) interesting and creative lectures, (3) approachable, (4) enthusiastic about teaching, (5) fair and realistic expectations, (6) humorous, happy, and positive, (7) effective communicator, (8) flexible and open-minded, (9) encourages student participation, and (10) encourages and cares for students.



Schaeffer et al. (2004) referred to teacher qualities and the description of each of those qualities in TBC as key components of effective college and university teaching. They suggested that ideal teachers should capitalize on a subset of behaviors that strengthen the investment of both teachers and students in the educational process.

### **Perceptive of Teaching Excellence Compared among Different Groups**

When comparing the perceptions of teaching excellence among novice (those in their first few years of university teaching) and expert faculty (those who had won a teaching award) in Australian institutes of higher education, Dunkin (1995) found that responses fell into one of four categories “(a) teaching as structuring learning, (b) teaching as motivating learning, (c) teaching as encouraging activity and independence in learning, and (d) teaching as establishing interpersonal relations conducive to learning” (p. # 24). Experts teachers showed more appreciation of all components that go into excellent teaching, while novices tended to focus on only a single dimension of excellent teaching.

Other studies compared the perceptions of teaching excellence between faculty and students. Comparing the views of faculty and students for “unmissable lecture,” Revell and Wainwright (2009), in the United Kingdom, found remarkable consistency between both group’s perceptions: both agreed on the importance of students’ involvement and interpersonal interactions and passion from the professor part.

Asking both students and teachers to ranking the importance of the 28 item in the TBC at a small community college, Schaeffer et al. (2003) found that there was a substantial overlap between faculty and students in the top ten qualities. Similar to Buskist et al. (2002), the following items were ranked among the top ten: approachable, creative and interesting; encouraging and caring, enthusiastic, flexible and open-minded, knowledgeable, realistic

expectations and respectful, which suggests that perceptions of both students and faculty of master teachers are relatively stable across settings. However, the few minor differences between the two groups showed that where faculty emphasis was more towards technical aspects of teaching, student emphasis was more towards interpersonal factors of teaching. Wann, (2001) reported similar findings with students and faculty at the traditional baccalaureate levels.

Long and Sparks (1997) asked participants (a sample of 200 undergraduate students, 15 faculty members, and 10 graduate teaching assistants) to respond to six open-ended questions about professorial behaviors that increased their interest, lowered interest early and that helped them perform well over the duration of the course. Whereas students emphasized more on personal characteristics (such as enthusiasm about teaching, clarity, approachability and rapport with student, and attendance to student needs) as indicators of teaching effectiveness, professors and TAs focused more on instructionally related behaviors (such as clarity of presentation). Gadzella, Tomcala, Fullwood, Lytton, and Benton (1992) reported similar results.

Carson (1996) analyzed qualitative responses to perceptions of teaching excellent among alumni (graduates of Rollins College between 1964 and 1990). Three themes were identified for what constitutes excellent teaching: 1) love for the subject matter taught; 2) respect and liking for students; and 3) connecting the previous two themes (i.e. relating knowledge of subject to their students).

Yair (2008) interviewed adults over 30 about memorable educational experiences that changed their life and found three key features: 1) interpersonal skills of the teacher that helped establish a good relationship with the teacher, 2) exceptional enthusiasm, passion and genuine care about subject matter, and 3) applying excellent pedagogical strategies.

Consistent with other research finding about excellent teaching, the three aspects could be integrated under two factors: interpersonal and technical skills.

Hill, Lomas and MacGregor, (2003) in a qualitative study about constituents of quality education, using 6 focused groups from a range of disciplines in higher education at a university college in United Kingdom, found that qualities of lecturers are among the most influential factors in forming the perceptive of educational quality to the students. Identified lecture qualities included, delivery in classroom, giving feedback to students, and establishing relationship with students in classroom.

Using a 63-item questionnaire, Yankowski (1993) asked participants (administrators, award- winning faculty, non-award winning faculty, and students at six Hawaii community colleges) to rate and rank the most important factors of teaching excellence. Results showed that 9 factors were identified as most important: (1) enjoyment of teaching, (2) respecting students, (3) simplifying complex concepts (4) enthusiasm about teaching material, (5) availability to students (6) listening to students, (7) providing clear and easily understandable answers to students' questions, (8) enjoyment of teaching the subject matter, and (9) well-organizing of materials.

### **Importance of Active Learning in Excellent Teaching**

Active learning is considered an important dimension that plays a substantial role in teaching excellence. Excellent teachers try to engage their students. Using active learning strategies helps instructors create a significant and enjoyable learning experience.

Active learning, a term that started to get attention in the early 1990s, as a new concept for teaching that is different from the traditional concept. In passive conventional learning, students usually just sit in the classroom and listen to the instructor, take notes,

memorize knowledge, and dump it back on the answer sheet during exams. This type of learning will generally lead to a limited retention rate of knowledge (McKeachie, 2002).

Freeman, Eddy, McDonough, Smith, Okoroafor, Jordt, and Wenderoth, ( 2014) conducted a meta-analysis of 225 studies of undergraduate education in STEM disciplines and concluded that active learning leads to increases in examination performance that consequently lead to raising average grade by half a letter. They also concluded that in active learning classes, failure rates were 55 % less compared failure rates under traditional lecturing.

Active learning is defined as instructional activities involving students in doing things and thinking about what they are doing (Bonwell & Eison, 1991). Students must write, discuss what they are learning, and connect past and current experiences with their daily lives. Meyers and Jones (1993) stated that active learning is built on two basic assumptions: (1) that learning is by nature an active endeavor and (2) that different people learn in different ways. “It is not a spectator sport” as Chickering and Gamson, (1987) referred to it. In active learning, more emphasis is placed on developing students skills and not just transmitting information, using higher order thinking (analysis, synthesis, evaluation) and students are engaged in activities (e.g., reading, discussing, writing); Oliveira, Oliveira, Neri de Souza, & Costa (2006).

In their article “The Seven Principle of Effective Undergraduate Education” (Chickering & Gamson, 1987) practically emphasized active learning. Research for over 50 years on practical experience of students and teachers supports these principles. It is not uncommon that effective teachers adopt these principles. The seven principles for good teaching are:

- 1) Encouraging contact between students and faculty, which includes both being accessible to students and making them feel comfortable in communication,
- 2) Developing cooperation among students and creating a cooperative atmosphere requires proactive design from the instructor,
- 3) Encouraging active learning which facilitates student learning by helping students think about, talk about, and use the information being covered in the course,
- 4) Giving prompt feedback. Immediate feedback supports learning. The quicker students can register how well they accomplished the activity, the more likely the students will be able to go through the critiques and accomplish accuracy. Feedback is crucial so that students can reflect on what they learned and what they still need to learn.
- 5) Emphasizing time on task. Ensuring that time is being used effectively also helps the students feel respected, the more time spent on the task, the better it will be comprehended
- 6) Communicating high expectations. Clear and early communicated expectations motivate students to perform well. Setting high expectations will most likely produce high level results; the self-fulfilling prophecy is applicable here.
- 7) Respecting diverse talents and ways of learning (being aware of the diversity in the classroom and offering a variety of strategies methods to accommodate a wide range of learning styles is important).

In conclusion, excellent teachers share several attributes. Those attributes are well agreed upon among several groups in academia including faculty, administrators and students and across different cultures. Two factors basically contribute to excellent teaching; technical skills and interpersonal skills.

## **Measuring Teaching Effectiveness**

One of the common methods of measuring teachers' effectiveness is the students' evaluations. Student evaluations of teaching (SETs) were initially developed for two purposes – evaluating teaching and providing faculty with feedback (McCarthy, 2012). Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness and excellence tend to be statistically reliable and valid (McKeachie, 1997). SETs have become a part of college systems and synonymous with the evaluation of teaching. In 1923, Max Freyd, a psychologist at University of Pennsylvania, proposed using a graphic rating scale to measure acceptable teacher's characteristics that are fundamental to the acquisition of a successful teaching technique. Some of the characteristics that Freyd identified were alertness, sense of humor, tact, patience, acceptance of criticism, and neatness in dress.

Probably the most important benefit of student evaluation is the feedback that is provided to instructors, so that courses and teaching procedures can be refined to enhance student learning (Groccia, 2007). Additionally, SETs offer other benefits including cost effectiveness (they produce data from large source, and not just one evaluator or one observer, at a low cost), and low sampling error with reliable and valid indications of teacher performance due to the use of most members of the population (Murray, 1987; Wilson & Ryan, 2012). Students experience the teacher for a long time and provide feedback based on the instructor's performance as a whole, more than an outside observer can judge in a single class. However, expecting an observer in the classroom may affect the performance of the instructor during the visit either positively or even negatively as well as affecting students' behavior as well. Ismail, Buskist, and Groccia (2012) suggested a more comprehensive model for peer observation that includes meeting with the students and collecting their feedback as well.

All in all, data collected from SETs (quantitative or qualitative) provide only one dimension (mainly professional competency and communication skills) of several approaches in evaluating teaching effectiveness of an instructor (Keeley, 2012). Using means or median of any given item in the survey instrument and comparing it to departmental, college or university averages would render the evaluation ineffective. Without considering the standard deviation, standard error, outliers, frequencies, class size, or situational context not only data would give potentially unreliable interpretation, but it would be possibly misleading, (Keeley, 2012).

In attempt to identify attributes of teachers that result in highest and lowest evaluation by students, Waters, Kemp, and Pucci (1988) asked a total of 100 university students to think about 2-3 teachers whom they had given highest and lowest scores in the evaluations to write down those attributes of the teacher or course that had most influenced their evaluations. The authors categorized students' responses in three general areas: Personal characteristics (e.g., enjoyment, enthusiasm, sense of humor, personable, indifferent, no personality, aloof), class characteristics (e.g., open to questions, organized, well-prepared, fair, boring, read from book, often late or absent), and interpersonal characteristics (e.g. willing to help, cares about students personally, hard to talk to, makes students uncomfortable). High student evaluations were connected to personal attributes (e.g. personality, sense of humor, enthusiasm, and the enjoyment of teaching) and interpersonal characteristics (e.g. learning students' names and helping students outside of class). Lower evaluations were related to class characteristics (e.g. discouraging classroom participation, coming to class late or not at all, and lecturing without varying the class routine). A similar correlation between student ratings and instructor's personality traits have been reported in other studies (Murray, Rushton, & Paunonen, 1990; Renaud & Murray, 1996). Personality traits such as energy and enthusiasm, positive regard for

others, and positive self-regard were positively correlated to perceived teaching effectiveness (Feldman, 1986). In addition, lecturing style of the instructor may affect the student evaluations (Naftulin, Ware, & Donnelly, 1973) because expressiveness tends to enhance students learning and subsequently they better value of the professor.

Balam (2006) proposed using professors' self-efficacy evaluation as a measure of effective teaching as complementary to the use of students' evaluation. The study also compared the perspectives of both students and faculty about the student evaluations myths. The study used two instruments, the Teaching Appraisal Inventory (TAI) to measure faculty self-efficacy and Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ; Marsh, 1982) to measure teaching effectiveness from students' perspective. A total of 968 students (97 graduate and 871 undergraduate) took the SEEQ, while 37 faculty members took the TAI. A significant relation was found between professor self-efficacy and teaching effectiveness regarding enthusiasm and breadth. Academic rank had a major influence on professors' overall efficacy beliefs in teaching as well as students' learning, class organization, rapport, exam/evaluation, and assignment. Professors had stronger agreement than the students that student ratings are both unreliable and invalid. High ratings were found to be associated with full professors, female students, postgraduate students, and students expecting to earn higher grades. Expected grade also had an effect on student ratings of professors' teaching effectiveness.

Similarly, Oesch (2005) found that some demographic factors had an effect on students' response to certain items that make up the teaching excellence dimensions.

Looking at another dimension for evaluating teaching effectiveness, Shao, Anderson, and Newsome, (2007) examined proper ways to measure teaching effectiveness. They presented a comparison of two surveys in which faculty and administrators were asked to provide their



opinions concerning how different items are currently being used and how these items should be used in evaluating overall faculty performance and teaching effectiveness. For teaching effectiveness, respondents tended to believe that currency in field, peers evaluations, classroom visits, and professor's preparation should be given more weight, while teaching awards and use of technology should not be given as much weight as they currently are. The study implied that there may be some dissatisfaction with current evaluation systems. Some finding alluded to that student evaluations should be only one part of a larger evaluation process.

### **Conclusion**

The current study was designed to investigate foreign-educated vs US-educated faculty's views of excellent teaching. Issues related to foreign-educated faculty were discussed, followed by review of literature on the concepts of effective and excellent teaching.

Many early and recent studies addressed the qualities of excellent teaching. However, only a limited amount of studies have attempted to explore foreign-educated perceptions of excellent teaching which indicates that more research, on how foreign-educated faculty view teaching excellence, is needed.

Foreign-educated faculty have a set of challenges different from their US-educated peers that may affect their teaching abilities. These challenges would make foreign-educated faculty unique, stimulating a need to investigate their views of excellent teaching. This current study investigated the views of excellent teaching among foreign-educated vs US-educated faculty.

In Chapter Three, a description of the methods used to address the above issue will be provided.

## CHAPTER 3: METHODS

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to determine what qualities/behaviors that foreign-educated faculty value as most important for teaching excellence compared to those valued by US-educated faculty. The TBC (Buskist et al., 2002) was the survey tool used in this research.

The first two chapters addressed the background of the problem, the research questions, the significance and limitations of the study, and literature review of relevant research. This chapter provides the research questions, explains the research design of the study and its rationale; lists participating institutions, describes the instrument used for the online survey, describes how the data were collected, processed, and analyzed.

The present study investigated the views of US-educated vs the foreign-educated faculty on what constitutes excellent teaching by ranking the ten most important of the 28 characteristics identified on the TBC (Buskist et al., 2002; Keeley et al., 2006). This process was used in order to assess whether there were any statistically significant differences in the ranking between these two groups for each of the 28 behaviors listed in the TBC. The frequency with which faculty responded to the each item was compared.

The present study also investigated if the demographic characteristics of faculty had an influence on their ranking of the 28 items which was assessed by comparing the rankings within demographics in general (e.g. male and female faculty in general) and then within the two main

groups (e.g. male and female within US- educated vs male and female within foreign-educated faculty).

### **Research Questions**

The purpose of this study is to answer the following questions:

- 1- What are the perceptions of teaching excellence among foreign-educated faculty who teach in US universities and how do those perceptions differ from native US-educated faculty?
- 2- Do foreign-educated and US-educated faculty demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, discipline, academic rank, attending faculty preparation programs and years of experience in teaching) have an influence on perceived teaching excellence?

### **Design and Instrumentation**

This study used a non-experimental descriptive comparative design with no treatment, and utilized a survey instrument to collect data. The dependent variable was the qualities/behaviors of teaching excellence in the TBC. Independent variables are country of college/university undergraduate education and the demographic characteristics of faculty.

The survey method is the most efficient means of collecting a large amount of data from a large sample. Use of survey is useful in collecting statistical estimates for a target population assuming that characteristics of the collected sample are present and distributed in same way they are in the targeted population (Fowler, 2008). Because the current survey software (Qualtrics) is available free of charge to Auburn University employees, distribution of the survey to participants was administered rapidly and free of charge.

## **The Instrument**

### **The Teacher Behavior Checklist**

The TBC is a 28-item student inventory that was originally developed by Buskist et al. (2002) to determine the qualities/behaviors of excellent teacher. TBC was previously validated and found to have sound psychometric properties (Keely et al., 2006).

In a 2-phase study that aimed to develop the items for the checklist, one group of students was asked to list the qualities of effective teachers. Another group of students was presented with the identified qualities and asked to provide specific behaviors that reflect those qualities or characteristics (Buskist et al., 2002). Twenty eight (28) items were identified with behavioral descriptors. In phase 2, the 28-item list was presented to both undergraduate students and faculty who were asked to rate the top 10 behaviors they felt excellent teachers exhibit. Both faculty and students agreed on six qualities as most exhibited in excellent teachers. Similar findings of agreement between students and faculty in rating the top 10 qualities and behaviors from the 28 items in the TBC was reported in a study in a community college setting (Schaeffer et al., 2003).

The TBC used in the present study consisted of two main sections. Section 1 included demographic information, which asked participants to indicate gender, academic rank, teaching experience, discipline, attending prior graduate program that prepared them for the professoriate, their country of birth, country of undergraduate degree, country of first higher education degree and country of highest degree. Section 2 of the survey consisted of the 28-item inventory of qualities/behaviors and descriptions of each.

## Participants

The population for this study consisted of faculty from universities from the SREB (Southern Regional Educational Board). Universities with similar research intensity were selected (high research or very high research according to Carnegie classification). Active faculty members (non-emeritus) were randomly selected from available email contacts in each department from the selected universities. However, attention was paid to select faculty from foreign countries to insure their reasonable representation in the collected sample. Email addresses of faculty from different departments (representing STEM and social/human sciences) were collected by visiting the websites of departments at the selected universities from the Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB). Faculty from the following universities were involved in the study:

- 1 Auburn University
- 2 Clemson University – S. Carolina
- 3 Florida Atlantic University
- 4 Florida State University
- 5 Louisiana State University (LSU)
- 6 Univ. of S. Carolina
- 7 University of Alabama at Birmingham
- 8 University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa
- 9 University of Kentucky
- 10 University of Memphis
- 11 University of North Carolina–Greensboro
- 12 University of Tennessee at Knoxville

- 13 University of Texas –Arlington
- 14 University of Texas –El Paso

### **Procedures and Data Collection**

A Human Subjects request from the Auburn University Office of Human Subjects Research protocol submission was required and approval was obtained. The Auburn University Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved this document for use from October 27, 2013 to October 26, 2016 (Protocol #13-362 EX 1310; See Appendix A).

For this study, the TBC survey was constructed via Qualtrics web-based software. The survey administration occurred three weeks after the beginning of spring semester 2014 (first dispatch on January 27, 2014). The TBC was administered to each faculty member electronically by the principal researcher, along with the informed consent notification.

Faculty members were provided with an overview of the study and completion instructions should they desire to participate. As mandated by the Auburn University IRB, participants were informed that their participation was voluntary; they could withdraw at any time and that their decision regarding participation would have no effect on their relationship with Auburn University. Participants were instructed to follow a link that led to the Qualtrics TBC survey if they chose to participate. The approximate time to finish the survey was estimated by 5-7 minutes (See Appendix B).

Once participants went to the online survey, they were asked to fill the first section with demographic information and then to go to the next page to complete the 28-item inventory by clicking on, holding, and dragging to the top of the list ONLY ten (10) qualities/behaviors (See Appendix C). Instructions at the top of this section were:

Below are 28 teacher's qualities and behaviors that reflect each quality.

Please click on, hold and drag to the top of the list **ONLY** ten (10) qualities/ behaviors that you think are most important to highly effective teaching at the college level, where item ranked "1" will be the most important, item ranked "2" will be second most important, and so on.

Please do not select fewer than 10 qualities/behaviors.

Participant responses to each of the 28 items were recorded directly on Qualtrics once participants hit submit. There was no return button on the survey and there was no means to keep track of how many times the participants' mice were moved. However, the duration of time taken to complete the survey was recorded for each anonymous participant. Participants could finish the survey and submit it immediately or return within a week to finish it.

An email message with the survey link was sent to 5238 faculty members. A reminder was sent to all participants two weeks after the first email. Out of those sent emails, 606 responded (11.6% response rate). A total of 507 participants completed and submitted their responses. Because the approximate time to complete the survey was estimated by 5-7 minutes, responses that were completed in less than 4 minutes were eliminated which was necessary to insure quality of the responses. The elimination reduced the total of responses to 448.

The final faculty population sample consisted of 448 participants, of which 309 (69%) were US-educated and 139 (31%) were foreign-educated as undergraduates. Within this US-educated sample population, 171 (55%, or 38.2% of total sample population) were males and 138 (45% or 30.8% of total sample population) were females. Within the foreign-educated

sample population, 90 (65% or 20.1% of total sample population) were males and 48 (35% or 10.7% of total sample population) were females.

After data collection, the colleges were collapsed into two categories to better reflect academic disciplines rather than specific colleges. Out of 448 total participants, 247 (55%) participants were from Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) and 198 (44%) were from Social/Human Sciences, while 3 participants did not identify their discipline.

### **Data Analysis**

To answer the research questions and determine if there was a significant difference between the studied variables and because collected data is categorical, non-parametric tests were used. Non-parametric tests are suitable when data distribution is on an ordinal or nominal scale (Gay, 1976). The statistical software, SPSS version 17 for Windows was used for all the analyses.

To answer Research Question One, faculty were asked to rank top 10 qualities in the TBC from their perspectives. Descriptive statistics were calculated to identify the frequency and percentage of responses for all the 28 items of the TBC from each group of respondents (i.e. US vs –foreign-educated). Sum of frequencies of the top ten categories (1-10) was used to compare the general rankings between the two groups. In this process, the number of times a quality/ behavior was ranked number 1 was summed with the number of times it was ranked number 2 and so on, to the number of times it was ranked number 10. The total was sorted from highest to lowest and compared between the two main groups (US- vs foreign-educated) which allowed the results to be compared to those of previous TBC studies.

Kruskal–Wallis (KW) test was used to compare mean ranks. The Kruskal–Wallis test is the most commonly used when there is one nominal variable and one measurement variable, and



the measurement variable does not meet the normality assumption of an ANOVA. It is the non-parametric analogue of a one-way ANOVA. A one-way ANOVA may yield inaccurate estimates of the P-value when the data are very far from normally distributed. The Kruskal–Wallis test does not make assumptions about normality. Like most non-parametric tests, it is performed on ranked data, so the measurement observations are converted to their ranks in the overall data set. The Kruskal–Wallis test starts by substituting the rank in the overall data set for each measurement value. Thus the smallest value gets a rank of 1, the next smallest gets a rank of 2, and so on. Tied observations get averaged ranks. The sum of the ranks is calculated for each group, then chi square (symbolized with  $X^2$ ) (or H test for Kruskal-Wallis) is calculated to compare the variance of the ranks among groups, with an adjustment for the number of ties (Handbook of Biological Statistics, 2009). Because the collected data for each quality/behavior are already in the form of ranks (1-28), it would be expected that the group with more frequent low values (e.g. 1s, 2s, 3s) to have the lower mean rank. Therefore, in this case, lower mean rank is an indicator of higher order for a given quality.

Chi Square test of the Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare the mean ranks of each of the 28 items between and within the two groups (i.e. US-educated vs Foreign-educated faculty). This chi-square test ( $X^2$ ) determines if an event occurs more frequently in one variable than it does in another (e.g. US- and foreign-educated faculty) or different categories (e.g. gender). Therefore, it verifies whether there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups. As the difference between those proportions –those observed and those that are hypothesized– increase, the chi-square value increases. Thus the chi-square test determines the degree to which those variables are significantly different (Gay, 1976). Significance level of 0.05 was used.

To answer Research Question Two, Descriptive statistics were calculated to identify the frequency and percentage of responses for each of the 28 items of the TBC within each group of respondents (US- vs foreign-educated) based on each demographic characteristic (e.g. gender, discipline). The sum of frequencies of the top ten categories (1-10) was used to compare the general rankings within each demographic characteristic. Total was sorted and compared, firstly, within each demographic characteristic in general and then specifically between the two main groups (US- vs foreign-educated) within each demographic characteristic (e.g. males within US- and foreign-educated and females within US- and foreign-educated faculty). The KW test was used to compare mean ranks within demographic characteristics.

### **The Reliability and Validity**

The TBC has been found to be psychometrically valid instrument for assessing the qualities of excellent teachers (Keely et al., 2006). The TBC was used with no modifications and therefore there were no concerns for validity or reliability in the present study.

### **Limitations of the Method**

Using an online survey provided many advantages. These include: the easiness of use, ability to reach faculty from many academic institutions in the southern US, the possibility to drag and drop items to the top of the list and readily collecting available data that can be exported to SPSS format. However, one of the limitations of this method was the low response rate for the online survey. The response rate (11.6%) was relatively low compared to the response rate that may have been received from face-to-face version of this survey (Nulty, 2008; Schaeffer et al., 2003).

For the online survey, participants were asked to click on, hold and drag to the top of the list ONLY ten (10) qualities/ behaviors that they think are most important to highly effective

teaching and sort those from highest to lowest. This method of ranking by moving qualities, instead of just give each quality a number on a Likert scale was uncommon. For someone who are used to Likert scales, this response may have caused some difficulty and consequently representing a limitation to the number of people who would be able to finish the survey. Clear instructions on top of the survey were provided to ease this process.

### **Summary**

This chapter covered the study design and implemented procedures used in collecting data to answer the research questions. The participants sample consisted of faculty members from the SREB institutions. The instrument used to collect the data was The TBC with accompanying demographic information. The collection and analysis procedures of data were discussed. In the next Chapter (IV) results of the analyses of the data will be presented.

## CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Individual items on the TBC were compared between both US-educated and foreign-educated faculty using descriptive statistics in SPSS (mainly frequency). Although there is abundance on literature about qualities of effective and excellent teaching among students and faculty in general, research relating specifically to the views of what constitutes excellent teaching is lacking. The first purpose of this research was to identify views of foreign-educated faculty who teach in American universities on what constitutes excellent teaching by comparing the ranking of top 10 items on the TBC. The second purpose of this research was to identify the degree to which demographic attributes (e.g. gender) between the two groups (i.e. US-educated and foreign-educated) affect the ranking of items on the TBC.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were formulated for this study:

- 1- What are the perceptions of teaching excellence among foreign-educated faculty who teach in US universities and how do those perceptions differ from native US-educated faculty?
- 2- Do foreign-educated and US-educated faculty demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, discipline, academic rank, attending faculty preparation programs and years of experience in teaching) have an influence on perceived teaching excellence?

### **Sample Demographics Results**

The final faculty population consisted of 448 participants, of which 309 (69%) were US-educated and 139 (31%) were foreign-educated undergraduates. Within this US-educated

population, 171 (55%) (or 38.2% of total population) were males and 138 (45% or 30.8% of total population) were females. Within the foreign-educated population, 90 (65% or 20.1% of total population) were males and 48 (35% or 10.7% of total population) were females (Table 4.1). Out of 448 total participants, 247 (55%) participants were from STEM and 198 (44%) were from Social/Human Sciences, while 3 participants did not identify their discipline.

The majority of foreign-born faculty were from Asia and Europe whether sorted by country of birth or country where undergraduate education was received.

Table 4.1. Respondents' Demographic Statistics

	US		Foreign			NA	
	n	%		n.	%	n	%
<b>Country of birth</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>64.3</b>		<b>160</b>	<b>35.7 (100%)</b>		
			Africa	10	6		
			Asia	61	38		
			Canada	7	4		
			Europe	48	30		
			Middle East	14	9		
			South America	19	12		
			Russia	1	1		
<b>Country of Undergraduate Education</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>69</b>		<b>139</b>	<b>31 (100%)</b>		
			Africa	3	2		
			Asia	61	44		
			Canada	9	6		
			Europe	39	28		
			Middle East	13	9		
			South America	12	9		
			Russia	2	1		
<b>Country of 1st higher ed. degree</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>81</b>		<b>83</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.4</b>
<b>Country of highest degree</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>90.8</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.4</b>

The years of experience in teaching ranged from 0 to 56 years and they were separated into three groups (0-5 year; novice, 6-15; intermediate; and above 15; expert). The majority of all faculty (249) had more than 15 years of teaching experience, 131 were intermediate and 68 participants were novice.

Table 4.1. Respondents' Demographic Statistics (cont.)

<b>Undergraduate Education</b>	<b>USA (N = 309)</b>		<b>Foreign (N =139)</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
Categories	<b>n</b>	<b>% Within</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>% Within</b>	<b>(n=448)</b>	
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	171	55.3	90	64.7	261	58.3
Female	138	44.7	48	34.5	186	41.5
Did not ID			1	0.7		
<b>Rank</b>						
Professor	98	31.7	51	36.7	149	33.3
Associate Professor	97	31.4	41	29.5	138	30.8
Assistant Professor	70	22.7	38	27.3	108	24.1
Other	44	14.2	9	6.5	53	11.8
<b>Teaching Experience (years)</b>						
0-5	38	12.3	30	21.6	68	15.2
6-15	86	27.8	45	32.4	131	29.2
Over 15	183	59.2	66	47.5	249	55.6
<b>Discipline</b>						
STEM	146	47.2	101	72.7	247	55.1
Social Sciences	162	52.4	36	25.9	198	44.2
Did not ID					3	0.7
<b>Graduate Developmental programs</b>						
YES	141	45.6	48	34.5	189	42.2
NO	167	54.0	91	65.5	258	57.6
Did not ID					1	0.2

## Data Analysis

### Answering Research Question One

To identify the top 10 qualities selected by both groups in general, the number of times each quality was ranked number 1 and 2,... to 10 were summed and those frequencies were sorted from highest to lowest. Table 4.2 shows this comparison of sorted frequencies, Kruskal-Wallis (KW) mean rank, and Chi square values for the TBC 28 items between US-undergraduate educated vs. Foreign-undergraduate educated faculty.

Nine qualities were selected by both US- and foreign-educated faculty as most important for excellent teaching, however, in different order. Both groups agreed that 1) knowledgeable about topic and 2) enthusiastic about teaching were the top qualities for excellent teaching. They also ranked similarly another 7 qualities as next highest in order. Those included 3) creative/interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, 8) manages class time and 9) accessible. It is worth mention that “Promotes discussion” was ranked as the 10<sup>th</sup> quality by US-educated while ranked 12<sup>th</sup> by foreign-educated. Similarly, “confident” was ranked 8<sup>th</sup> by foreign-educated, while it was ranked 11<sup>th</sup> by US-educated faculty.

However, KW Chi square values comparing mean rank showed statistically significant difference between the two groups in several qualities. Foreign-educated faculty significantly ranked “confident,” “effective communicator,” “encourages/cares,” and “happy/positive/humorous” significantly higher than did the US-educated faculty. “Enthusiastic” and “respectful” were ranked statistically significantly different between the two

groups, where US-faculty ranked those qualities more frequently in the higher categories than foreign-educated faculty.

The frequency and percentage of each quality were presented for each of top 10 qualities in Table 4.3. Table 4.3 shows in detail the number of times each quality was ranked number “1” by faculty from US-educated and foreign- educated categories, number of times it was ranked number “2,” etc. up to 10.

In answering Research Question One (What are the perceptions of teaching excellence among foreign-educated faculty who teach in US universities and how do those perceptions differ from native US-educated faculty?) the data in tables 4.2, and 4.3 revealed that both US- and foreign-educated faculty agreed on the top nine qualities although the order among those qualities was significantly different in some qualities.



Table 4.2. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- educated vs. foreign- educated faculty

Quality/Behavior	US- educated (n=309)				Foreign- educated (n=139)				Kruskal-Wallis		
	n	%	Rank	KW Mean Rank	n	%	Rank	KW Mean Rank	$X^2$	df	Asymp. Sig.
Accessible	127	41.1	9	229.71	70	50.4	9	212.92	1.634	1	0.201
<b>Approachable/Personable</b>	180	58.3	6	224.83	81	58.3	6	223.77	0.006	1	0.936
Authoritative	53	17.2	20	227.24	33	23.7	16	218.4	0.452	1	0.501
Confident	120	38.8	11	235.2	74	53.2	8	200.71	6.848	1	<b>0.009</b>
<b>Creative/Interesting</b>	212	68.6	3	222.44	95	68.3	5	229.09	0.255	1	0.614
<b>Effective communicator</b>	208	67.3	5	232.79	108	77.7	3	206.08	4.102	1	<b>0.043</b>
<b>Encourages/Cares</b>	146	47.2	7	235.34	79	56.8	7	200.4	7.02	1	<b>0.008</b>
<b>Enthusiastic</b>	257	83.2	2	213.6	110	79.1	2	248.73	7.123	1	<b>0.008</b>
Establishes goals	104	33.7	14	221.94	33	23.7	17	230.19	0.392	1	0.531
Flexible/open minded	98	31.7	18	219.41	33	23.7	18	235.82	1.55	1	0.213
Good listener	55	17.8	19	223.66	21	15.1	21	226.37	0.043	1	0.836
Happy/positive/humorous	29	9.4	24	233.65	24	17.3	20	204.17	5.023	1	<b>0.025</b>
Humble	27	8.7	26	230.83	15	10.8	22	210.43	2.408	1	0.121
<b>Knowledgeable</b>	276	89	1	229.63	124	89.2	1	213.1	1.676	1	0.196
<b>Manages class time</b>	144	46.6	8	225.04	63	45.3	10	223.31	0.017	1	0.896
Prepared	100	32.4	16	224.43	42	30.2	13	224.65	0	1	0.986
Presents current information	21	6.8	28	228.69	12	8.6	26	215.19	1.058	1	0.304
Professional	115	37.2	12	226.61	57	41	11	219.82	0.265	1	0.607
<b>Promotes critical thinking</b>	212	68.6	4	225.4	99	71.2	4	222.5	0.048	1	0.826
Promotes discussion	121	39.2	10	219.87	45	32.4	12	234.8	1.285	1	0.257
Provides const. feedback	33	10.7	23	224.2	13	9.4	25	225.18	0.006	1	0.94
Rapport	37	12	21	224.59	9	6.5	28	224.31	0	1	0.983
Realistic expectations	101	32.7	15	221.2	41	29.5	14	231.83	0.657	1	0.417
Respectful	99	32	17	215.29	31	22.3	19	244.98	5.145	1	<b>0.023</b>
Sensitive/Persistent	27	8.7	27	227.15	14	10.1	24	218.6	0.451	1	0.502
Strives to be a better teacher	107	34.6	13	223.66	39	28.1	15	226.38	0.045	1	0.832
Technologically competent	36	11.7	22	227.21	15	10.8	23	218.47	0.562	1	0.453
Understanding	28	9.1	25	227.71	10	7.2	27	217.36	0.939	1	0.333

Table 4.3. Rankings and percentages of top 10 teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty

Quality	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total/ %
<b>Knowledgeable about topic</b>	USA	117	41	44	23	7	19	9	6	8	2	276
	<b>n=309</b>	38.1%	13.4%	14.3%	7.5%	2.3%	6.2%	2.9%	2.0%	2.6%	.7%	89.3
	Foreign	59	32	9	5	4	5	6	4	1	0	125
	<b>n=139</b>	41.8%	22.7%	6.4%	3.5%	2.8%	3.5%	4.3%	2.8%	.7%	.0%	89.9
<b>Enthusiastic</b>	USA	44	50	35	31	24	16	20	17	12	8	257
		14.3%	16.3%	11.4%	10.1%	7.8%	5.2%	6.5%	5.5%	3.9%	2.6%	83.2
	Foreign	10	13	12	16	22	9	9	14	4	2	111
		7.1%	9.2%	8.5%	11.3%	15.6%	6.4%	6.4%	9.9%	2.8%	1.4%	79.9
<b>Creative/ Interesting</b>	USA	12	22	30	24	27	24	25	15	19	14	212
		3.9%	7.2%	9.8%	7.8%	8.8%	7.8%	8.1%	4.9%	6.2%	4.6%	68.6
	Foreign	8	4	12	13	17	12	9	8	8	5	96
		5.7%	2.8%	8.5%	9.2%	12.1%	8.5%	6.4%	5.7%	5.7%	3.5%	69.1
<b>Promotes critical thinking</b>	USA	35	42	25	27	24	14	12	15	6	12	212
		11.4%	13.7%	8.1%	8.8%	7.8%	4.6%	3.9%	4.9%	2.0%	3.9%	68.6
	Foreign	9	20	23	12	5	7	7	3	6	7	99
		6.4%	14.2%	16.3%	8.5%	3.5%	5.0%	5.0%	2.1%	4.3%	5.0%	71.2
<b>Effective communicator</b>	USA	21	36	30	19	25	26	14	16	10	10	207
		6.8%	11.7%	9.8%	6.2%	8.1%	8.5%	4.6%	5.2%	3.3%	3.3%	67.0
	Foreign	17	14	14	16	11	11	9	5	9	4	110
		12.1%	9.9%	9.9%	11.3%	7.8%	7.8%	6.4%	3.5%	6.4%	2.8%	79.1

<b>Approachable/ Personable</b>	USA	12	20	12	11	18	26	22	21	17	21	180
		3.9%	6.5%	3.9%	3.6%	5.9%	8.5%	7.2%	6.8%	5.5%	6.8%	58.3
	Foreign	8	7	5	5	8	10	7	10	13	10	83
		5.7%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	5.7%	7.1%	5.0%	7.1%	9.2%	7.1%	59.7

<b>Encourages/ Cares for students</b>	USA	9	7	12	11	20	14	19	17	23	13	145
		2.9%	2.3%	3.9%	3.6%	6.5%	4.6%	6.2%	5.5%	7.5%	4.2%	46.9
	Foreign	3	8	8	9	7	16	11	6	10	3	81
		2.1%	5.7%	5.7%	6.4%	5.0%	11.3%	7.8%	4.3%	7.1%	2.1%	58.3

<b>Manages class time</b>	USA	5	16	15	23	22	13	14	9	18	9	144
		1.6%	5.2%	4.9%	7.5%	7.2%	4.2%	4.6%	2.9%	5.9%	2.9%	46.6
	Foreign	3	7	13	8	2	8	10	6	6	2	65
		2.1%	5.0%	9.2%	5.7%	1.4%	5.7%	7.1%	4.3%	4.3%	1.4%	46.8

<b>Accessible</b>	USA	12	10	11	14	8	9	16	16	15	15	126
		3.9%	3.3%	3.6%	4.6%	2.6%	2.9%	5.2%	5.2%	4.9%	4.9%	40.8
	Foreign	8	2	4	5	7	7	5	12	8	13	71
		5.7%	1.4%	2.8%	3.5%	5.0%	5.0%	3.5%	8.5%	5.7%	9.2%	51.1

<b>Promotes discussion</b>	USA	0	2	9	10	10	23	12	25	13	17	121
		.0%	.7%	2.9%	3.3%	3.3%	7.5%	3.9%	8.1%	4.2%	5.5%	39.2
	Foreign	1	1	4	5	5	5	4	7	5	9	46
		.7%	.7%	2.8%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	2.8%	5.0%	3.5%	6.4%	33.1

## Answering Research Question Two

### Gender Effect:

The second research question was: Do international faculty's demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, discipline, rank, attending faculty preparation programs and years of experience in teaching) have an influence on perceived teaching excellence between US vs. Foreign-educated faculty? To answer the question, descriptive statistics (i.e. frequency and percentages) were calculated for each of the 28 qualities on the TBC. In addition, the KW test was used to compare mean rank within each demographic characteristic in general (e.g. males and female overall) and then for each demographic characteristic within the two main groups.

Table 4.4 shows the comparison of ranking of frequencies (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) for the TBC 28 items between male and female faculty. Results in table (4.4) shows that male and female agreed on the top 8 qualities as most important ones to excellent teaching, but with different order in some qualities.

Both groups agreed that 1) knowledgeable about topic and 2) Enthusiastic about teaching were the top qualities for excellent teaching. The other six qualities, with slightly different order between the two groups, included: 3) creative/interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, 8) manages class time. "Accessible" and confident" came in the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> rank, respectively by US-educated faculty and ranked 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> by foreign-educated faculty.

However, KW Chi square values comparing mean rank showed statistically significant difference between the two groups in several qualities. With lower mean rank, male faculty significantly ranked "confident," "effective communicator," "humble" and "manages class time/punctuality" in higher rank than did the female faculty. Conversely, "creative/interesting,"

”flexible/open minded,” and “promotes discussion” were ranked statistically significantly higher by female faculty than by male faculty.

Table 4.5 displays the gender effect on ranking of TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty within gender. There was no significant difference between US-and foreign-educated male faculty in the top 9 qualities. Nevertheless, results showed that there was a statistically significant difference between males who were US- vs foreign- educated in two qualities. With lower mean rank, foreign-educated male faculty ranked “confident” and “prepared” significantly more important than did male us-educated faculty. US-educated female faculty gave higher ranking for “enthusiastic,” “prepared,” and “respectful”. However, foreign-educated female faculty gave higher rank to “encourages/cares for students” than did US-educated faculty

Table 4.6 shows in detail the number of times each quality (of the above eight qualities) was ranked number “1” by faculty from US-educated and foreign- educated categories (within gender), how many times it was ranked number “2,” etc. up to 10.

Table 4.4. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between male and female faculty

Quality/Behavior	Male (n=261)				Female (n=186)				Kruskal-Wallis		
	n	%	Rank	KW Mean Rank	n	%	Rank	KW Mean Rank	X <sup>2</sup>	df	Asy mp. Sig.
Accessible	124	47.5	9	216.60	72	36.4	11	234.39	2.087	1	.149
<b>Approachable/Personable</b>	152	58.2	6	220.44	110	55.6	6	229.00	.481	1	.488
Authoritative	50	19.2	19	216.85	37	18.7	19	234.03	1.946	1	.163
Confident	122	46.7	10	211.37	70	35.4	12	241.72	6.032	1	<b>.014</b>
<b>Creative/Interesting</b>	165	63.2	5	238.85	140	70.7	3	203.16	8.336	1	<b>.004</b>
<b>Effective communicator</b>	201	77	3	204.23	115	58.1	5	251.75	14.778	1	<b>.000</b>
<b>Encourages/Cares</b>	135	51.7	7	219.24	91	46	7	230.68	.855	1	.355
<b>Enthusiastic</b>	213	81.6	2	230.48	153	77.3	2	214.91	1.590	1	.207
Establishes goals	73	28	17	232.29	64	32.3	16	212.37	2.596	1	.107
Flexible/open minded	65	24.9	18	234.08	65	32.8	15	209.86	3.840	1	<b>.050</b>
Good listener	48	18.4	20	216.38	27	13.6	20	234.69	2.204	1	.138
Happy/positive/humorous	38	14.6	21	214.73	15	7.6	25	237.00	3.261	1	.071
Humble	31	11.9	22	210.54	11	5.6	27	242.88	6.888	1	<b>.009</b>
<b>Knowledgeable</b>	229	87.7	1	229.12	169	85.4	1	216.82	1.055	1	.304
<b>Manages class time</b>	132	50.6	8	210.48	76	38.4	9	242.98	6.897	1	<b>.009</b>
Prepared	75	28.7	16	228.11	66	33.3	14	218.24	.637	1	.425
Presents current info	24	9.2	27	215.01	9	4.5	28	236.62	3.087	1	.079
Professional	94	36	11	226.75	76	38.4	10	220.13	.287	1	.592
<b>Promotes critical thinking</b>	178	68.2	4	225.54	130	65.7	4	221.83	.090	1	.764
Promotes discussion	78	29.9	15	236.54	87	43.9	8	206.40	5.957	1	<b>.015</b>
Provides const. feedback	30	11.5	23	226.75	16	8.1	23	220.15	.291	1	.590
Rapport	26	10	25	223.62	20	10.1	22	224.53	.006	1	.941
Realistic expectations	80	30.7	13	222.42	63	31.8	17	226.22	.096	1	.757
Respectful	81	31	12	219.00	49	24.7	18	231.02	.959	1	.327
Sensitive/Persistent	26	10	26	219.40	16	8.1	24	230.45	.857	1	.354
Strives to be a better teacher	79	30.3	14	232.79	67	33.8	13	211.67	3.067	1	.080
Technologically competent	29	11.1	24	226.90	22	11.1	21	219.94	.405	1	.525
Understanding	23	8.8	28	221.61	15	7.6	26	227.36	.330	1	.566

Table 4.5. Comparison of mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- vs foreign-educated faculty within gender

Gender	Male		Kruskal -Wallis			Female		Kruskal -Wallis		
	Mean Rank		$X^2$	df	Asymp. Sig.	Mean Rank		$X^2$	df	Asymp. Sig.
	US	Foreign				US	Foreign			
	n=171	n=90				n=138	n=48			
Accessible	132.48	128.18	.193	1	.660	96.28	85.51	1.449	1	.229
Approachable/Personable	134.24	124.85	.919	1	.338	90.67	101.64	1.491	1	.222
Authoritative	129.39	134.05	.227	1	.634	97.28	82.63	2.680	1	.102
Confident	139.51	114.84	6.334	1	<b>.012</b>	94.91	89.45	.370	1	.543
Creative/Interesting	126.31	139.91	1.922	1	.166	97.17	82.95	2.500	1	.114
Effective communicator	135.22	122.98	1.563	1	.211	96.01	86.28	1.168	1	.280
Encourages/Cares	136.82	119.95	2.960	1	.085	98.03	80.47	3.810	1	<b>.051</b>
Enthusiastic	127.45	137.74	1.104	1	.293	86.80	112.76	8.372	1	<b>.004</b>
Establishes goals	127.74	137.19	.930	1	.335	94.41	90.90	.152	1	.696
Flexible/open minded	128.38	135.98	.603	1	.437	91.60	98.96	.668	1	.414
Good listener	133.37	126.50	.493	1	.483	90.16	103.10	2.083	1	.149
Happy/positive/humorous	136.08	121.34	2.270	1	.132	96.50	84.86	1.686	1	.194
Humble	135.07	123.27	1.454	1	.228	95.09	88.94	.472	1	.492
Knowledgeable	134.88	123.62	1.400	1	.237	95.28	88.38	.633	1	.426
Manages class time	128.70	135.36	.460	1	.498	94.98	89.25	.405	1	.525
Prepared	138.43	116.89	4.835	1	<b>.028</b>	86.79	112.79	8.357	1	<b>.004</b>
Presents current info.	134.73	123.92	1.228	1	.268	93.54	93.39	.000	1	.986
Professional	133.95	125.39	.763	1	.383	92.80	95.51	.091	1	.763
Promotes critic. thinking	130.84	131.31	.002	1	.962	94.17	91.57	.084	1	.773
Promotes discussion	126.53	139.49	1.758	1	.185	94.67	90.14	.254	1	.614
Provides constr. feedback	134.30	124.72	.978	1	.323	90.48	102.19	1.726	1	.189
Rapport	134.31	124.72	.981	1	.322	90.64	101.73	1.559	1	.212
Realistic expectations	126.15	140.22	2.083	1	.149	94.50	90.63	.188	1	.664
Respectful	129.89	133.11	.110	1	.740	86.23	114.41	9.933	1	<b>.002</b>
Sensitive/Persistent	137.13	119.36	3.550	1	.060	89.96	103.69	2.478	1	.115
Strives to be a better	126.50	139.56	1.886	1	.170	97.31	82.55	2.789	1	.095
Technologically competent	132.77	127.63	.352	1	.553	94.64	90.23	.307	1	.580
Understanding	134.61	124.14	1.700	1	.192	93.23	94.28	.021	1	.883

Table 4.6. Rankings and percentages of top eight teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty within gender

Approachable/Personable														
Gender	Edu.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total	
Male	US	n	5	14	8	5	8	11	15	13	9	7	95	
		%	3.0%	8.3%	4.7%	3.0%	4.7%	6.5%	8.9%	7.7%	5.3%	4.1%	56.2%	
	Foreign	n	7	5	4	3	6	7	6	7	7	7	5	57
		%	7.6%	5.4%	4.3%	3.3%	6.5%	7.6%	6.5%	7.6%	7.6%	7.6%	5.4%	62.0%
Female	US	n	7	6	4	6	10	15	7	8	8	14	85	
		%	5.1%	4.3%	2.9%	4.3%	7.2%	10.9%	5.1%	5.8%	5.8%	10.1%	61.6%	
	Foreign	n	1	2	1	2	2	3	1	3	5	5	25	
		%	2.1%	4.2%	2.1%	4.2%	4.2%	6.3%	2.1%	6.3%	10.4%	10.4%	52.1%	
Creative/Interesting														
Gender	Edu.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total	
Male	US	n	7	10	17	12	14	14	12	7	11	7	111	
		%	4.1%	5.9%	10.1%	7.1%	8.3%	8.3%	7.1%	4.1%	6.5%	4.1%	65.7%	
	Foreign	n	2	1	3	12	14	4	6	6	4	3	55	
		%	2.2%	1.1%	3.3%	13.0%	15.2%	4.3%	6.5%	6.5%	4.3%	3.3%	59.8%	
Female	US	n	5	12	13	12	13	10	13	8	8	7	101	
		%	3.6%	8.7%	9.4%	8.7%	9.4%	7.2%	9.4%	5.8%	5.8%	5.1%	73.2%	
	Foreign	n	6	3	9	1	3	8	3	2	4	1	40	
		%	12.5%	6.3%	18.8%	2.1%	6.3%	16.7%	6.3%	4.2%	8.3%	2.1%	83.3%	
Effective communicator														
Gender	Edu.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total	
Male	US	n	14	24	20	12	14	16	5	10	5	5	125	
		%	8.3%	14.2%	11.8%	7.1%	8.3%	9.5%	3.0%	5.9%	3.0%	3.0%	74.0%	
	Foreign	n	12	11	9	12	7	9	7	3	5	2	77	
		%	13.0%	12.0%	9.8%	13.0%	7.6%	9.8%	7.6%	3.3%	5.4%	2.2%	83.7%	
Female	US	n	7	12	10	7	11	10	9	6	5	5	82	
		%	5.1%	8.7%	7.2%	5.1%	8.0%	7.2%	6.5%	4.3%	3.6%	3.6%	59.4%	
	Foreign	n	5	3	5	4	4	2	2	2	4	2	33	
		%	10.4%	6.3%	10.4%	8.3%	8.3%	4.2%	4.2%	4.2%	8.3%	4.2%	68.8%	
Encourages/Cares for students														
Gender	Edu.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total	
Male	US	n	5	5	6	7	15	3	14	7	12	8	82	
		%	3.0%	3.0%	3.6%	4.1%	8.9%	1.8%	8.3%	4.1%	7.1%	4.7%	48.5%	
	Foreign	n	0	4	6	6	5	11	10	3	7	1	53	
		%	.0%	4.3%	6.5%	6.5%	5.4%	12.0%	10.9%	3.3%	7.6%	1.1%	57.6%	
Female	US	n	4	2	6	4	5	11	5	10	11	5	63	
		%	2.9%	1.4%	4.3%	2.9%	3.6%	8.0%	3.6%	7.2%	8.0%	3.6%	45.7%	
	Foreign	n	3	4	2	3	2	5	1	3	3	2	28	
		%	6.3%	8.3%	4.2%	6.3%	4.2%	10.4%	2.1%	6.3%	6.3%	4.2%	58.3%	



Enthusiastic														
Gender	Edu.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total	
Male	US	n	22	23	18	16	16	13	10	11	5	6	140	
		%	13.0%	13.6%	10.7%	9.5%	9.5%	7.7%	5.9%	6.5%	3.0%	3.6%	82.8%	
	Foreign	n	8	11	7	10	10	7	6	6	11	1	2	73
		%	8.7%	12.0%	7.6%	10.9%	10.9%	7.6%	6.5%	12.0%	1.1%	2.2%	79.3%	
Female	US	n	22	27	17	15	8	3	10	6	7	2	117	
		%	15.9%	19.6%	12.3%	10.9%	5.8%	2.2%	7.2%	4.3%	5.1%	1.4%	84.8%	
	Foreign	n	2	2	5	6	12	2	2	2	3	3	0	37
		%	4.2%	4.2%	10.4%	12.5%	25.0%	4.2%	4.2%	6.3%	6.3%	.0%	77.1%	
Knowledgeable about topic														
Gender	Edu.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total	
Male	US	n	63	20	22	14	4	12	4	2	5	2	148	
		%	37.3%	11.8%	13.0%	8.3%	2.4%	7.1%	2.4%	1.2%	3.0%	1.2%	87.6%	
	Foreign	n	38	19	5	5	3	4	3	3	4	1	0	82
		%	41.3%	20.7%	5.4%	5.4%	3.3%	4.3%	3.3%	4.3%	1.1%	.0%	89.1%	
Female	US	n	54	21	22	9	3	7	5	4	3		128	
		%	39.1%	15.2%	15.9%	6.5%	2.2%	5.1%	3.6%	2.9%	2.2%		92.8%	
	Foreign	n	21	12	4	0	1	1	3	0	0		42	
		%	43.8%	25.0%	8.3%	.0%	2.1%	2.1%	6.3%	.0%	.0%		87.5%	
Manages class time														
Gender	Edu.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Male	US	n	4	10	10	16	16	6	10	5	7	6	90	
		%	2.4%	5.9%	5.9%	9.5%	9.5%	3.6%	5.9%	3.0%	4.1%	3.6%	53.3%	
	Foreign	n	2	4	9	5	2	6	5	4	5	0	42	
		%	2.2%	4.3%	9.8%	5.4%	2.2%	6.5%	5.4%	4.3%	5.4%	.0%	45.7%	
Female	US	n	1	6	5	7	6	7	4	4	11	3	54	
		%	.7%	4.3%	3.6%	5.1%	4.3%	5.1%	2.9%	2.9%	8.0%	2.2%	39.1%	
	Foreign	n	1	3	4	3	0	2	5	2	1	2	23	
		%	2.1%	6.3%	8.3%	6.3%	.0%	4.2%	10.4%	4.2%	2.1%	4.2%	47.9%	
Promotes critical thinking														
Gender	Edu.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Male	US	n	22	24	13	9	10	7	9	13	3	6	116	
		%	13.0%	14.2%	7.7%	5.3%	5.9%	4.1%	5.3%	7.7%	1.8%	3.6%	68.6%	
	Foreign	n	7	11	14	8	3	4	5	1	5	5	63	
		%	7.6%	12.0%	15.2%	8.7%	3.3%	4.3%	5.4%	1.1%	5.4%	5.4%	68.5%	
Female	US	n	13	18	12	18	14	7	3	2	3	6	96	
		%	9.4%	13.0%	8.7%	13.0%	10.1%	5.1%	2.2%	1.4%	2.2%	4.3%	69.6%	
	Foreign	n	1	9	9	4	2	3	2	2	2	1	2	35
		%	2.1%	18.8%	18.8%	8.3%	4.2%	6.3%	4.2%	4.2%	4.2%	2.1%	4.2%	72.9%

## **Discipline Effect**

Table 4.7 shows the comparison of ranking of frequencies (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) for the TBC 28 items between faculty from STEM and Social Sciences. Both groups agreed that 1) knowledgeable about topic and 2) enthusiastic about teaching were the top qualities for excellent teaching. They also agreed on other 6 qualities as most important in teaching excellence with different order between the two groups. Those qualities included 3) creative/interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, and 8) manages class time/punctuality.

However, KW Chi square values comparing mean rank showed statistically significant difference between the two groups in several qualities. With lower KW mean rank, STEM faculty significantly ranked accessible, confident, effective communicator, happy/positive, humble and present current information in higher rank than did the Social Sciences faculty. Conversely, “promotes discussion” was ranked statistically significantly higher by Social Sciences faculty (See table 4.7).

Table 4.7. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between STEM vs social sciences faculty

Quality/Behavior	STEM (n=247)				Social Sciences (n=198)				Kruskal -Wallis		
	n	%	Rank	Mean Rank	n	%	Rank	Mean Rank	$X^2$	df	Asymp. Sig.
Accessible	128	51.8	7	208.99	69	34.8	12	240.47	6.67	1	<b>0.010</b>
<b>Approachable/Personable</b>	143	57.9	6	223.19	119	60.1	5	222.76	0.00	1	0.972
Authoritative	52	21.1	19	215.04	35	17.7	19	232.93	2.15	1	0.142
Confident	118	47.8	9	209.36	76	38.4	11	240.02	6.29	1	<b>0.012</b>
<b>Creative/Interesting</b>	171	69.2	4	224.26	137	69.2	4	221.43	0.05	1	0.817
<b>Effective communicator</b>	199	80.6	3	198.55	117	59.1	6	253.51	20.18	1	<b>0.000</b>
<b>Encourages/Cares</b>	122	49.4	8	225.81	104	52.5	7	219.49	0.27	1	0.606
<b>Enthusiastic</b>	210	85	2	217.88	157	79.3	2	229.39	0.89	1	0.346
Establishes goals	76	30.8	15	220.73	61	30.8	17	225.83	0.17	1	0.677
Flexible/open minded	64	25.9	18	231.03	65	32.8	14	212.99	2.18	1	0.140
Good listener	42	17	20	219.39	34	17.2	20	227.50	0.44	1	0.507
Happy/positive/humorous	35	14.2	21	211.21	18	9.1	26	237.70	4.71	1	<b>0.030</b>
Humble	30	12.1	22	205.72	12	6.1	28	244.55	10.14	1	<b>0.001</b>
<b>Knowledgeable</b>	214	86.6	1	232.11	186	93.9	1	211.63	2.99	1	0.084
<b>Manages class time</b>	118	47.8	10	219.84	90	45.5	9	226.94	0.34	1	0.562
Prepared	77	31.2	14	219.00	63	31.8	16	227.99	0.54	1	0.462
Presents current info.	20	8.1	26	212.15	13	6.6	27	236.54	4.02	1	<b>0.045</b>
Professional	84	34	11	229.49	88	44.4	10	214.91	1.42	1	0.233
<b>Promotes critic. thinking</b>	170	68.8	5	226.77	140	70.7	3	218.30	0.48	1	0.489
Promotes discussion	72	29.1	17	245.82	95	48	8	194.53	17.62	1	<b>0.000</b>
Provides const. feedback	25	10.1	24	222.97	21	10.6	24	223.04	0.00	1	0.996
Rapport	24	9.7	25	225.76	21	10.6	23	219.56	0.26	1	0.608
Realistic expectations	81	32.8	12	221.04	63	31.8	15	225.45	0.13	1	0.717
Respectful	73	29.6	16	226.26	55	27.8	18	218.94	0.36	1	0.547
Sensitive/Persistent	19	7.7	27	232.01	23	11.6	22	211.76	2.94	1	0.086
Strives to be a better teacher	78	31.6	13	225.65	67	33.8	13	219.69	0.25	1	0.617
Technologically competent	28	11.3	23	221.29	24	12.1	21	225.14	0.13	1	0.721
Understanding	19	7.7	28	224.15	19	9.6	25	221.56	0.07	1	0.793

Table 4.8 displays the mean rank of TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty within discipline. There was a statistically significant difference between US- vs foreign- educated in within STEM in three qualities. With lower mean rank, foreign-educated faculty ranked “confident,” “encourages/cares,” and “knowledgeable” significantly more important than did US-educated faculty. US-educated faculty from social sciences gave higher ranking for: “enthusiastic” and “manages class time.”

Table 4.9 displays the discipline effect on ranking of top 8 qualities that were agreed upon between US- and foreign-educated faculty. This table shows in detail the frequency and percentage of each quality over the top 10 categories.

Table 4.8. Comparison of mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- vs foreign-educated faculty within disciplines (STEM vs Social sciences)

Discipline	STEM Mean Rank					Social Sciences Mean Rank				
	US	Foreign	Kruskal -Wallis			US	Foreign	Kruskal -Wallis		
Quality/behavior	<b>n=146</b>	<b>n=101</b>	$X^2$	<i>df</i>	Asymp. Sig.	<b>n=162</b>	<b>n=36</b>	$X^2$	<i>df</i>	Asymp. Sig.
Accessible	125.10	122.41	.086	1	.770	100.43	95.33	.238	1	.626
Approachable/Personable	126.14	120.91	.322	1	.571	98.16	105.53	.493	1	.483
Authoritative	125.30	122.12	.119	1	.730	99.33	100.28	.008	1	.928
Confident	132.37	111.90	4.933	1	<b>.026</b>	100.14	96.64	.111	1	.739
Creative/Interesting	126.68	120.12	.507	1	.477	96.58	112.63	2.321	1	.128
Effective communicator	126.22	120.79	.347	1	.556	101.20	91.83	.791	1	.374
Encourages/Cares	134.32	109.08	7.486	1	<b>.006</b>	101.82	89.04	1.475	1	.225
Enthusiastic	119.61	130.34	1.359	1	.244	93.55	126.26	9.693	1	<b>.002</b>
Establishes goals	122.04	126.83	.270	1	.603	98.67	103.25	.190	1	.663
Flexible/open minded	124.58	123.17	.023	1	.879	96.03	115.13	3.291	1	.070
Good listener	122.45	126.25	.171	1	.679	99.25	100.63	.017	1	.896
Happy/positive/humorous	130.59	114.47	3.069	1	.080	100.68	94.19	.382	1	.537
Humble	126.19	120.84	.339	1	.561	100.18	96.43	.128	1	.721
Knowledgeable	132.23	112.11	5.012	1	<b>.025</b>	99.79	98.18	.026	1	.873
Manages class time	130.18	115.06	2.682	1	.101	95.80	116.15	3.730	1	<b>.053</b>
Prepared	126.14	120.90	.324	1	.569	97.51	108.44	1.079	1	.299
Presents current info.	128.37	117.68	1.357	1	.244	98.23	105.22	.446	1	.504
Professional	127.47	118.99	.846	1	.358	100.48	95.08	.263	1	.608
Promotes critical thinking	124.51	123.27	.018	1	.893	100.69	94.15	.387	1	.534
Promotes discussion	123.05	125.37	.064	1	.801	100.74	93.90	.422	1	.516
Provides const. feedback	127.35	119.16	.807	1	.369	97.70	107.61	.903	1	.342
Rapport	126.57	120.28	.477	1	.490	98.71	103.04	.173	1	.677
Realistic expectations	117.45	133.48	3.055	1	.080	101.81	89.10	1.478	1	.224
Respectful	117.65	133.18	2.885	1	.089	96.02	115.17	3.348	1	.067
Sensitive/Persistent	129.07	116.67	1.961	1	.161	98.75	102.89	.164	1	.685
Strives to be a better	121.54	127.55	.449	1	.503	101.18	91.93	.809	1	.369
Technologically competent	124.52	123.24	.025	1	.875	101.83	89.01	1.903	1	.168
Understanding	128.40	117.64	2.103	1	.147	98.44	104.29	.471	1	.493

Table 4.9. Rankings and percentages of top eight teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty within discipline (STEM vs Social sciences)

		Approachable/Personable											
Discipline	Under. Ed	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
STEM	US	n	6	13	6	2	6	10	11	12	7	7	80
		%	4.2%	9.0%	4.2%	1.4%	4.2%	6.9%	7.6%	8.3%	4.9%	4.9%	55.6%
	Foreign	n	6	6	3	3	7	9	6	8	6	7	61
		%	5.8%	5.8%	2.9%	2.9%	6.8%	8.7%	5.8%	7.8%	5.8%	6.8%	59.2%
Social Sciences	US	n	6	7	6	9	11	16	11	9	10	14	99
		%	3.7%	4.3%	3.7%	5.6%	6.8%	9.9%	6.8%	5.6%	6.2%	8.6%	61.1%
	Foreign	n	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	7	3	21
		%	2.8%	2.8%	5.6%	5.6%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	5.6%	19.4%	8.3%	58.3%
		Creative/Interesting											
Discipline	Under. Ed	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
STEM	US	n	8	9	14	8	10	9	14	9	10	8	99
		%	5.6%	6.3%	9.7%	5.6%	6.9%	6.3%	9.7%	6.3%	6.9%	5.6%	68.8%
	Foreign	n	6	4	10	10	14	8	6	5	5	3	71
		%	5.8%	3.9%	9.7%	9.7%	13.6%	7.8%	5.8%	4.9%	4.9%	2.9%	68.9%
Social Sciences	US	n	4	13	16	16	17	15	11	6	9	5	112
		%	2.5%	8.0%	9.9%	9.9%	10.5%	9.3%	6.8%	3.7%	5.6%	3.1%	69.1%
	Foreign	n	2	0	2	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	25
		%	5.6%	.0%	5.6%	8.3%	8.3%	11.1%	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%	5.6%	69.4%
		Effective communicator											
Discipline	Under. Ed	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
STEM	US	n	12	21	19	9	15	16	6	3	6	4	111
		%	8.3%	14.6%	13.2%	6.3%	10.4%	11.1%	4.2%	2.1%	4.2%	2.8%	77.1%
	Foreign	n	13	11	10	14	9	9	7	4	7	2	86
		%	12.6%	10.7%	9.7%	13.6%	8.7%	8.7%	6.8%	3.9%	6.8%	1.9%	83.5%
Social Sciences	US	n	9	14	11	10	10	10	8	13	4	6	95
		%	5.6%	8.6%	6.8%	6.2%	6.2%	6.2%	4.9%	8.0%	2.5%	3.7%	58.6%
	Foreign	n	4	3	4	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	23
		%	11.1%	8.3%	11.1%	5.6%	5.6%	5.6%	5.6%	2.8%	5.6%	2.8%	63.9%
		Encourages/Cares for students											
Discipline	Under. Ed	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
STEM	US	n	2	4	3	3	9	5	12	6	12	5	61
		%	1.4%	2.8%	2.1%	2.1%	6.3%	3.5%	8.3%	4.2%	8.3%	3.5%	42.4%
	Foreign	n	1	4	7	6	5	9	10	6	9	2	59
		%	1.0%	3.9%	6.8%	5.8%	4.9%	8.7%	9.7%	5.8%	8.7%	1.9%	57.3%
Social Sciences	US	n	7	3	9	8	11	8	7	11	11	8	83
		%	4.3%	1.9%	5.6%	4.9%	6.8%	4.9%	4.3%	6.8%	6.8%	4.9%	51.2%
	Foreign	n	2	3	1	3	2	7	1	0	1	1	21
		%	5.6%	8.3%	2.8%	8.3%	5.6%	19.4%	2.8%	.0%	2.8%	2.8%	58.3%

Discipline	Under. Ed	Rank	Enthusiastic										Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
STEM	US	n	25	17	18	13	13	11	8	10	5	4	124
		%	17.4%	11.8%	12.5%	9.0%	9.0%	7.6%	5.6%	6.9%	3.5%	2.8%	86.1%
	Foreign	n	8	13	11	14	11	8	5	11	2	2	85
		%	7.8%	12.6%	10.7%	13.6%	10.7%	7.8%	4.9%	10.7%	1.9%	1.9%	82.5%
Social Sciences	US	n	18	33	17	18	11	5	12	7	7	4	132
		%	11.1%	20.4%	10.5%	11.1%	6.8%	3.1%	7.4%	4.3%	4.3%	2.5%	81.5%
	Foreign	n	2	0	1	2	11	1	4	3	2	0	26
		%	5.6%	.0%	2.8%	5.6%	30.6%	2.8%	11.1%	8.3%	5.6%	.0%	72.2%

Discipline	Under. Ed	Rank	Knowledgeable about topic										Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
STEM	US	n	45	21	24	12	3	7	4	3	3	2	124
		%	31.3%	14.6%	16.7%	8.3%	2.1%	4.9%	2.8%	2.1%	2.1%	1.4%	86.1%
	Foreign	n	45	22	5	4	3	5	2	3	1	0	90
		%	43.7%	21.4%	4.9%	3.9%	2.9%	4.9%	1.9%	2.9%	1.0%	.0%	87.4%
Social Sciences	US	n	72	20	20	11	4	12	5	3	5		152
		%	44.4%	12.3%	12.3%	6.8%	2.5%	7.4%	3.1%	1.9%	3.1%		93.8%
	Foreign	n	14	10	4	1	1	0	3	1	0		34
		%	38.9%	27.8%	11.1%	2.8%	2.8%	.0%	8.3%	2.8%	.0%		94.4%

Discipline	Under. Ed	Rank	Manages class time										Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
STEM	US	n	1	6	6	12	10	7	5	3	8	6	64
		%	.7%	4.2%	4.2%	8.3%	6.9%	4.9%	3.5%	2.1%	5.6%	4.2%	44.4%
	Foreign	n	2	6	9	8	2	7	8	6	5	0	53
		%	1.9%	5.8%	8.7%	7.8%	1.9%	6.8%	7.8%	5.8%	4.9%	.0%	51.5%
Social Sciences	US	n	4	10	9	11	12	6	9	6	9	3	79
		%	2.5%	6.2%	5.6%	6.8%	7.4%	3.7%	5.6%	3.7%	5.6%	1.9%	48.8%
	Foreign	n	1	1	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	2	12
		%	2.8%	2.8%	11.1%	.0%	.0%	2.8%	5.6%	.0%	2.8%	5.6%	33.3%

Discipline	Under. Ed	Rank	Promotes critical thinking										Total
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
STEM	US	n	17	15	15	13	10	7	7	7	2	6	99
		%	11.8%	10.4%	10.4%	9.0%	6.9%	4.9%	4.9%	4.9%	1.4%	4.2%	68.8%
	Foreign	n	7	12	17	9	4	5	5	2	4	5	70
		%	6.8%	11.7%	16.5%	8.7%	3.9%	4.9%	4.9%	1.9%	3.9%	4.9%	68.0%
Social Sciences	US	n	18	27	10	13	14	7	5	8	4	6	112
		%	11.1%	16.7%	6.2%	8.0%	8.6%	4.3%	3.1%	4.9%	2.5%	3.7%	69.1%
	Foreign	n	2	8	6	3	1	1	2	1	2	2	28
		%	5.6%	22.2%	16.7%	8.3%	2.8%	2.8%	5.6%	2.8%	5.6%	5.6%	77.8%

## **Effect of Prior Graduate Developmental Program**

Table 4.10 shows the comparison of ranking of frequencies (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) for the TBC 28 items between faculty who participated in Graduate Developmental programs (e.g., Preparing Future Faculty Programs) and those who did not. Both groups agreed that 1) knowledgeable about topic and 2) enthusiastic about teaching were the top qualities for excellent teaching. They also agreed on other 7 qualities as most important in teaching excellence with different order between the two groups. Those qualities included 3) creative/interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, 8) manages class time, and 9) confident. The KW Chi square values comparing mean rank (Table 4.10) showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups except for two qualities, where faculty with no prior teaching training significantly ranked “accessible”, and “prepared” in higher rank.



Table 4.10. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between faculty who participated in prior graduate programs (e.g. PFF) and Faculty who did not.

Quality/Behavior	PFF (n=189)				No PFF (n=258)				Kruskal -Wallis		
	n	%	Mean rank	Rank	n	%	Rank	Mean rank	$X^2$	<i>df</i>	Asymp. Sig.
Accessible	70	35.2	238.84	11	127	49.2	8	213.13	4.378	1	<b>.036</b>
<b>Approachable/Personable</b>	115	57.8	224.22	6	147	57	6	223.84	.001	1	.975
Authoritative	36	18.1	228.40	19	51	19.8	19	220.78	.385	1	.535
<b>Confident</b>	80	40.2	227.39	9	113	43.8	10	221.52	.227	1	.634
<b>Creative/Interesting</b>	135	67.8	222.78	3	173	67.1	5	224.89	.029	1	.864
<b>Effective communicator</b>	130	65.3	230.84	5	185	71.7	3	218.99	.922	1	.337
<b>Encourages/Cares</b>	95	47.7	219.30	7	130	50.4	7	227.44	.435	1	.509
<b>Enthusiastic</b>	150	75.4	231.32	2	216	83.7	2	218.64	1.060	1	.303
Establishes goals	62	31.2	218.53	15	74	28.7	18	228.01	.591	1	.442
Flexible/open minded	53	26.6	227.86	18	77	29.8	14	221.17	.294	1	.588
Good listener	30	15.1	232.72	20	45	17.4	20	217.61	1.508	1	.219
Happy/positive/humorous	21	10.6	232.14	23	32	12.4	21	218.03	1.315	1	.252
Humble	22	11.1	226.17	22	20	7.8	27	222.41	.094	1	.759
<b>Knowledgeable</b>	166	83.4	222.34	1	234	90.7	1	225.22	.058	1	.810
<b>Manages class time</b>	91	45.7	220.57	8	116	45	9	226.51	.231	1	.631
Prepared	55	27.6	238.20	16	87	33.7	13	213.60	3.980	1	<b>.046</b>
Presents current info.	15	7.5	228.04	27	18	7	28	221.04	.325	1	.568
Professional	80	40.2	218.19	10	91	35.3	12	228.26	.666	1	.414
<b>Promotes critic. thinking</b>	131	65.8	221.60	4	179	69.4	4	225.76	.113	1	.736
Promotes discussion	70	35.2	220.96	12	97	37.6	11	226.23	.183	1	.669
Provides constr. feedback	20	10.1	222.91	24	26	10.1	24	224.80	.024	1	.877
Rapport	15	7.5	233.25	28	31	12	22	217.23	1.727	1	.189
Realistic expectations	67	33.7	222.54	14	76	29.5	15	225.07	.043	1	.837
Respectful	54	27.1	232.37	17	75	29.1	17	217.87	1.402	1	.236
Sensitive/Persistent	17	8.5	228.60	25	26	10.1	25	220.63	.448	1	.503
Strives to be a better advisor	70	35.2	213.26	13	76	29.5	16	231.87	2.393	1	.122
Technologically competent	25	12.6	217.94	21	27	10.5	23	228.44	.926	1	.336
Understanding	16	8	224.66	26	23	8.9	26	223.52	.013	1	.909

Table 4.11 displays the mean rank of TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty within the two categories (Prior graduate preparation and no prior preparation in teaching). There was a statistically significant difference between US- vs foreign-educated within prior graduate preparation in two qualities. Within those who received prior graduate preparation, US-educated faculty ranked “promotes critical thinking” significantly higher while foreign-educated faculty ranked ‘Respectful’ higher. Within those who did not receive prior graduate preparation in teaching, foreign-educated faculty gave significantly higher rank for: “confident,” “effective communicator,” “encourages/cares,” “happy/positive and humble,” while US-educated faculty gave significantly higher ranking for “enthusiastic.”

Table 4.12 displays the effect of prior preparation as graduate students on ranking of top nine teaching qualities that were agreed upon between US- and foreign-educated faculty. This table shows in detail the frequency and percentage of each quality over the top 10 categories.

Table 4.11. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities within prior graduate preparation.

Prior Grad. Prep.	Prior Graduate Preparation Mean Rank					No Prior Graduate Preparation Mean Rank				
	US	Foreign	Kruskal -Wallis			US	Foreign	Kruskal -Wallis		
			$X^2$	$df$	Aysmp. Sign.			$X^2$	$df$	Aysmp. Sign.
	<b>n=141</b>	<b>n=48</b>				<b>n=167</b>	<b>n=91</b>			
Accessible	96.32	91.14	.327	1	.568	132.67	123.69	.862	1	.353
Approachable/Personable	91.09	106.50	2.865	1	.091	133.66	121.86	1.487	1	.223
Authoritative	93.45	99.55	.451	1	.502	134.23	120.82	1.926	1	.165
Confident	92.77	101.56	.932	1	.334	142.95	104.81	15.487	1	<b>.000</b>
Creative/Interesting	95.87	92.46	.140	1	.708	126.56	134.89	.737	1	.391
Effective communicator	94.92	95.23	.001	1	.973	138.17	113.59	6.434	1	<b>.011</b>
Encourages/Cares	94.80	95.57	.007	1	.933	141.76	106.99	12.866	1	<b>.000</b>
Enthusiastic	91.64	104.86	2.111	1	.146	121.13	144.87	6.022	1	<b>.014</b>
Establishes goals	91.54	105.18	2.241	1	.134	131.01	126.74	.194	1	.660
Flexible/open minded	92.44	102.51	1.220	1	.269	126.94	134.20	.563	1	.453
Good listener	94.34	96.94	.082	1	.775	129.00	130.41	.021	1	.884
Happy/positive/humorous	96.32	91.11	.328	1	.567	136.98	115.77	4.808	1	<b>.028</b>
Humble	94.39	96.79	.070	1	.792	136.88	115.96	4.689	1	<b>.030</b>
Knowledgeable	98.25	85.45	2.123	1	.145	131.11	126.55	.234	1	.628
Manages class time	95.06	94.81	.001	1	.978	130.60	127.48	.103	1	.748
Prepared	93.81	98.49	.264	1	.607	129.91	128.75	.014	1	.905
Presents current info.	94.69	95.91	.018	1	.893	134.49	120.34	2.153	1	.142
Professional	96.24	91.34	.289	1	.591	131.13	126.50	.229	1	.632
Promotes critic. thinking	100.38	79.19	5.419	1	<b>.020</b>	124.02	139.56	2.572	1	.109
Promotes discussion	91.87	104.19	1.830	1	.176	128.19	131.90	.146	1	.702
Provides const. feedback	92.60	102.04	1.095	1	.295	131.94	125.03	.519	1	.471
Rapport	92.08	103.58	1.637	1	.201	132.14	124.66	.608	1	.435
Realistic expectations	92.17	103.32	1.515	1	.218	129.69	129.15	.003	1	.956
Respectful	89.26	111.86	6.231	1	<b>.013</b>	125.37	137.09	1.487	1	.223
Sensitive/Persistent	95.55	93.38	.061	1	.805	131.23	126.32	.276	1	.599
Strives to be a better	99.24	82.55	3.463	1	.063	124.72	138.27	2.085	1	.149
Technologically competent	95.56	93.34	.073	1	.787	132.10	124.73	.759	1	.384
Understanding	96.93	89.34	1.056	1	.304	130.64	127.41	.168	1	.682

Table 4.12: Rankings and percentages of top nine teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty prior graduate preparation

		Approachable/Personable											
		Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
PFF	US	n	6	7	3	4	10	18	12	10	7	12	89
		%	4.3%	5.0%	2.1%	2.9%	7.1%	12.9%	8.6%	7.1%	5.0%	8.6%	63.6%
	Foreign	n	2	2	0	2	1	3	2	5	6	3	26
		%	4.1%	4.1%	.0%	4.1%	2.0%	6.1%	4.1%	10.2%	12.2%	6.1%	53.1%
No PFF	US	n	6	13	9	7	8	8	10	11	10	9	91
		%	3.6%	7.8%	5.4%	4.2%	4.8%	4.8%	6.0%	6.6%	6.0%	5.4%	54.8%
	Foreign	n	6	5	5	3	7	7	5	5	7	7	57
		%	6.5%	5.4%	5.4%	3.3%	7.6%	7.6%	5.4%	5.4%	7.6%	7.6%	62.0%
		Creative/Interesting											
		Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
PFF	US	n	4	6	17	10	15	10	14	5	9	8	98
		%	2.9%	4.3%	12.1%	7.1%	10.7%	7.1%	10.0%	3.6%	6.4%	5.7%	70.0%
	Foreign	n	2	1	7	3	6	5	5	5	2	1	37
		%	4.1%	2.0%	14.3%	6.1%	12.2%	10.2%	10.2%	10.2%	4.1%	2.0%	75.5%
No PFF	US	n	8	16	13	14	12	14	11	10	10	6	114
		%	4.8%	9.6%	7.8%	8.4%	7.2%	8.4%	6.6%	6.0%	6.0%	3.6%	68.7%
	Foreign	n	6	3	5	10	11	7	4	3	6	4	59
		%	6.5%	3.3%	5.4%	10.9%	12.0%	7.6%	4.3%	3.3%	6.5%	4.3%	64.1%
		Effective communicator											
		Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
PFF	US	n	12	14	16	6	11	8	10	9	4	4	94
		%	8.6%	10.0%	11.4%	4.3%	7.9%	5.7%	7.1%	6.4%	2.9%	2.9%	67.1%
	Foreign	n	5	3	5	2	4	4	4	3	4	2	36
		%	10.2%	6.1%	10.2%	4.1%	8.2%	8.2%	8.2%	6.1%	8.2%	4.1%	73.5%
No PFF	US	n	9	21	14	13	14	18	4	7	6	6	112
		%	5.4%	12.7%	8.4%	7.8%	8.4%	10.8%	2.4%	4.2%	3.6%	3.6%	67.5%
	Foreign	n	12	11	9	14	7	7	5	2	5	2	74
		%	13.0%	12.0%	9.8%	15.2%	7.6%	7.6%	5.4%	2.2%	5.4%	2.2%	80.4%
		Encourages/Cares for students											
		Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
PFF	US	n	8	5	7	6	7	6	6	9	7	7	68
		%	5.7%	3.6%	5.0%	4.3%	5.0%	4.3%	4.3%	6.4%	5.0%	5.0%	48.6%
	Foreign	n	0	4	2	4	2	4	3	1	4	3	27
		%	.0%	8.2%	4.1%	8.2%	4.1%	8.2%	6.1%	2.0%	8.2%	6.1%	55.1%
No PFF	US	n	1	2	5	5	12	8	13	8	16	6	76
		%	.6%	1.2%	3.0%	3.0%	7.2%	4.8%	7.8%	4.8%	9.6%	3.6%	45.8%
	Foreign	n	3	4	6	5	5	12	8	5	6	0	54
		%	3.3%	4.3%	6.5%	5.4%	5.4%	13.0%	8.7%	5.4%	6.5%	.0%	58.7%

		Enthusiastic											
		Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
PFF	US	n	19	23	10	15	11	10	10	5	7	1	111
		%	13.6%	16.4%	7.1%	10.7%	7.9%	7.1%	7.1%	3.6%	5.0%	.7%	79.3%
	Foreign	n	2	6	3	5	9	4	2	4	3	1	39
		%	4.1%	12.2%	6.1%	10.2%	18.4%	8.2%	4.1%	8.2%	6.1%	2.0%	79.6%
No PFF	US	n	25	27	25	16	13	6	9	12	5	7	145
		%	15.1%	16.3%	15.1%	9.6%	7.8%	3.6%	5.4%	7.2%	3.0%	4.2%	87.3%
	Foreign	n	8	7	9	11	13	5	7	10	1	1	72
		%	8.7%	7.6%	9.8%	12.0%	14.1%	5.4%	7.6%	10.9%	1.1%	1.1%	78.3%

		Knowledgeable about topic											
		Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
PFF	US	n	55	17	22	7	3	8	4	3	4		123
		%	39.3%	12.1%	15.7%	5.0%	2.1%	5.7%	2.9%	2.1%	2.9%		87.9%
	Foreign	n	23	10	3	2	2	1	2	0	0		43
		%	46.9%	20.4%	6.1%	4.1%	4.1%	2.0%	4.1%	.0%	.0%		87.8%
No PFF	US	n	62	24	21	16	4	11	5	3	4	2	152
		%	37.3%	14.5%	12.7%	9.6%	2.4%	6.6%	3.0%	1.8%	2.4%	1.2%	91.6%
	Foreign	n	36	22	6	3	2	4	4	4	1	0	82
		%	39.1%	23.9%	6.5%	3.3%	2.2%	4.3%	4.3%	4.3%	1.1%	.0%	89.1%

		Manages class time											
		Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
PFF	US	n	3	7	8	10	11	8	7	6	4	3	67
		%	2.1%	5.0%	5.7%	7.1%	7.9%	5.7%	5.0%	4.3%	2.9%	2.1%	47.9%
	Foreign	n	2	3	5	4	1	1	4	1	1	2	24
		%	4.1%	6.1%	10.2%	8.2%	2.0%	2.0%	8.2%	2.0%	2.0%	4.1%	49.0%
No PFF	US	n	2	9	7	12	11	5	7	3	14	6	76
		%	1.2%	5.4%	4.2%	7.2%	6.6%	3.0%	4.2%	1.8%	8.4%	3.6%	45.8%
	Foreign	n	1	4	8	4	1	7	6	5	5	0	41
		%	1.1%	4.3%	8.7%	4.3%	1.1%	7.6%	6.5%	5.4%	5.4%	.0%	44.6%

		Promotes critical thinking											
		Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
PFF	US	n	16	19	7	16	8	5	8	4	0	5	88
		%	11.4%	13.6%	5.0%	11.4%	5.7%	3.6%	5.7%	2.9%	.0%	3.6%	62.9%
	Foreign	n	3	10	9	5	3	3	4	1	2	3	43
		%	6.1%	20.4%	18.4%	10.2%	6.1%	6.1%	8.2%	2.0%	4.1%	6.1%	87.8%
No PFF	US	n	19	23	18	11	16	9	4	10	6	7	123
		%	11.4%	13.9%	10.8%	6.6%	9.6%	5.4%	2.4%	6.0%	3.6%	4.2%	74.1%
	Foreign	n	6	10	14	7	2	4	3	2	4	4	56
		%	6.5%	10.9%	15.2%	7.6%	2.2%	4.3%	3.3%	2.2%	4.3%	4.3%	60.9%

Confident													
		Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
PFF	US	n	2	6	4	11	6	5	3	7	8	8	60
		%	1.4%	4.3%	2.9%	7.9%	4.3%	3.6%	2.1%	5.0%	5.7%	5.7%	42.9%
	Foreign	n	1	0	2	2	4	0	2	2	2	2	5
		%	2.0%	.0%	4.1%	4.1%	8.2%	.0%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%	10.2%
No PFF	US	n	1	6	7	9	8	5	6	3	4	9	58
		%	.6%	3.6%	4.2%	5.4%	4.8%	3.0%	3.6%	1.8%	2.4%	5.4%	34.9%
	Foreign	n	1	7	7	9	6	4	6	3	6	6	55
		%	1.1%	7.6%	7.6%	9.8%	6.5%	4.3%	6.5%	3.3%	6.5%	6.5%	59.8%

### Academic Rank Effect

Table 4.13 displays the comparison of ranking of frequencies between different Academic ranks of faculty (professor, associate, assistant and other) for the 28 teaching qualities. The “other” category may include instructors or lecturers. Across academic ranks, respondents agreed on nine qualities, with difference in order, to be the top most important to teaching excellence. Those qualities were 1) knowledgeable about topic, 2) enthusiastic about teaching, 3) promotes critical thinking, 4) effective communicator, 5) creative/interesting, 6) approachable/personable, 7) manages class time, 8) encourages/cares for students, and 9) confident.

KW Chi square values showed that there were no statistically significant differences among the four categories of academic ranks, except for “encourages/cares for students” and “realistic expectations”. Others ranked “encourages/cares for students” the highest among the four categories, while professors ranked “realistic expectations” highest among the four categories.

Table 4.14 displays the mean ranks of TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty within the four faculty academic ranks. There were statistically significant differences between US- vs foreign- educated within faculty academic ranks in a few

qualities. Within professors, there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups (US- vs foreign-educated faculty) except for one quality, where foreign-educated faculty ranked “encourages/cares” significantly higher. Within associate professor, foreign-educated also ranked “encourages/cares significantly higher, while US-educated faculty ranked “enthusiastic about teaching,” “establishes goals,” and “provides constructive feedback” significantly higher than foreign-educated associate professors. Within assistant professors, US-educated faculty also ranked “enthusiastic about teaching” significantly higher, while foreign-educated faculty ranked “effective communicator” significantly higher. Within the Other category, no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups except in “respectful,” whereas US-educated faculty ranked it significantly higher.

Table 4.13. Comparison of mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities among different academic ranks (professor, associate, assistant and other)

	Professor (n=149)			Assoc. Prof. (n=138)			Assis. Prof. (n=108)			Others (n=53)			Kruskal -Wallis		
	n	Rank	Mean rank	n	Rank	Mean rank	n	Rank	Mean rank	n	Rank	Mean rank	$X^2$	df	Aysm p. Sign.
Accessible	68	<b>9</b>	223.65	62	<b>8</b>	225.09	43	12	229.82	24	<b>8</b>	192.61	.515	3	.916
Approachable/Personable	83	<b>6</b>	239.22	83	<b>6</b>	213.39	59	<b>6</b>	230.23	36	<b>4</b>	250.35	5.038	3	.169
Authoritative	33	19	223.61	23	20	222.18	18	19	227.42	13	17	247.69	.129	3	.988
Confident	59	<b>10</b>	233.14	55	<b>10</b>	233.29	53	<b>7</b>	208.77	24	<b>9</b>	205.65	3.641	3	.303
Creative/Interesting	100	<b>5</b>	232.89	90	<b>5</b>	231.49	75	<b>4</b>	221.88	42	<b>2</b>	188.06	5.297	3	.151
Effective communicator	106	<b>4</b>	214.50	99	<b>3</b>	221.84	75	<b>5</b>	229.01	34	<b>6</b>	209.37	3.208	3	.361
Encourages/Cares	69	<b>8</b>	228.63	67	<b>7</b>	233.96	52	<b>8</b>	229.90	36	<b>5</b>	226.55	8.178	3	<b>.042</b>
Enthusiastic	119	<b>2</b>	227.41	118	<b>2</b>	216.51	83	<b>2</b>	229.69	45	<b>1</b>	200.36	.794	3	.851
Establishes goals	38	17	236.48	45	16	220.18	32	15	229.14	21	11	228.31	4.811	3	.186
Flexible/open minded	35	18	238.03	49	12	208.54	30	17	235.49	16	13	223.95	5.661	3	.129
Good listener	26	20	224.90	26	19	215.01	15	20	245.48	8	20	246.38	4.785	3	.188
Happy/positive/humorous	15	23	230.31	19	21	225.65	12	24	232.00	6	23	234.49	4.508	3	.212
Humble	15	22	233.79	18	22	209.21	6	28	238.35	3	26	204.21	4.651	3	.199
Knowledgeable	137	<b>1</b>	221.23	124	<b>1</b>	216.08	95	<b>1</b>	224.50	42	<b>3</b>	214.50	4.013	3	.260
Manages class time	78	<b>7</b>	208.64	59	<b>9</b>	235.54	46	<b>10</b>	234.29	24	<b>10</b>	177.25	3.922	3	.270
Prepared	54	14	206.84	37	17	227.87	35	14	236.16	14	16	255.63	4.697	3	.195
Presents current info.	14	25	216.72	8	28	218.61	10	25	240.88	1	28	242.92	2.638	3	.451
Professional	58	11	221.77	47	15	239.88	47	<b>9</b>	208.88	18	12	205.36	3.605	3	.307
Promotes critic. thinking	111	<b>3</b>	215.69	92	<b>4</b>	233.26	76	<b>3</b>	214.08	30	<b>7</b>	227.08	3.747	3	.290
Promotes discussion	55	12	217.61	49	13	228.36	46	11	218.33	16	14	189.89	2.321	3	.508
Provides constr. feedback	16	21	223.16	15	24	209.96	10	26	239.21	5	24	236.14	3.674	3	.299



Rapport	13	27	230.09	10	27	235.48	15	21	212.72	8	21	224.73	3.570	3	.312
Realistic expectations	54	13	204.97	48	14	220.75	29	18	251.34	11	19	209.97	8.610	3	<b>.035</b>
Respectful	51	15	202.49	34	18	233.38	31	16	240.39	13	18	220.41	6.847	3	.077
Sensitive/Persistent	13	26	215.65	12	26	230.77	14	22	219.65	3	27	236.37	2.421	3	.490
Strives to be a better teacher	38	16	235.57	50	11	220.00	41	13	209.15	16	15	241.61	3.401	3	.334
Technologically competent	14	24	225.61	17	23	225.09	14	23	222.10	7	22	230.89	.066	3	.996
Understanding	9	28	229.06	15	25	218.59	10	27	228.07	5	25	219.76	.959	3	.811

Table 4.14. Comparison of mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- vs foreign-educated faculty within academic ranks of faculty (professor, associate, assistant and other)

Rank	Full professor			Associate professor			Assistant professor			Other		
	Mean rank		KW* X <sup>2</sup>	Mean rank		KW X <sup>2</sup>	Mean rank		KW X <sup>2</sup>	Mean rank		KW X <sup>2</sup>
	US	Foreign		US	Foreign		US	Foreign		US	Foreign	
	n=98	n=51	Aysmp. Sign.	n=97	n=41	Aysmp. Sign.	n=70	n=38	Aysmp. Sign.	n=44	n=9	Aysmp. Sign.
Accessible	79.41	66.52	.082	67.06	75.27	.268	58.11	47.86	.101	27.18	26.11	.849
Approachable/Personable	77.70	69.81	.288	66.59	76.39	.186	57.13	49.66	.234	26.58	29.06	.660
Authoritative	76.45	72.22	.568	67.69	73.78	.410	57.04	49.82	.247	27.74	23.39	.439
Confident	79.15	67.03	.102	72.49	62.43	.175	57.89	48.26	.126	27.28	25.61	.766
Creative/Interesting	73.63	77.63	.591	66.90	75.66	.238	55.77	52.16	.566	28.44	19.94	.131
Effective communicator	76.36	72.39	.593	71.34	65.15	.404	58.96	46.28	<b>.044</b>	27.11	26.44	.905
Encourages/Cares	80.52	64.39	<b>.030</b>	74.85	56.85	<b>.015</b>	55.81	52.09	.554	27.43	24.89	.651
Enthusiastic	73.64	77.62	.592	65.04	80.06	<b>.042</b>	49.63	63.47	<b>.027</b>	26.78	28.06	.821
Establishes goals	76.80	71.54	.479	64.18	82.09	<b>.016</b>	56.25	51.28	.429	27.47	24.72	.627
Flexible/open minded	75.45	74.14	.860	65.43	79.13	.065	53.85	55.70	.769	27.02	26.89	.981
Good listener	73.74	77.42	.620	70.14	67.99	.771	55.14	53.33	.773	27.01	26.94	.990
Happy/positive/humorous	79.63	66.11	.068	71.96	63.67	.263	57.28	49.38	.208	27.78	23.17	.411
Humble	78.06	69.12	.228	70.67	66.73	.595	57.71	48.58	.144	27.08	26.61	.933
Knowledgeable	75.97	73.14	.694	71.63	64.45	.313	55.96	51.82	.497	26.74	28.28	.781
Manages class time	72.40	79.99	.308	67.88	73.34	.462	58.36	47.38	.081	27.61	24.00	.522
Prepared	78.35	68.57	.188	66.92	75.61	.241	54.11	55.21	.862	26.20	30.89	.406
Presents current info.	76.81	71.53	.476	67.46	74.33	.351	56.46	50.88	.372	28.49	19.72	.118
Professional	76.97	71.21	.438	68.84	71.07	.763	55.01	53.57	.819	26.90	27.50	.915
Promotes critical thinking	73.23	78.39	.487	70.03	68.24	.810	55.79	52.13	.561	27.03	26.83	.972
Promotes discussion	71.35	82.02	.150	67.05	75.29	.266	53.51	56.33	.654	28.01	22.06	.289
Provides constr. feedback	78.65	67.99	.146	62.27	86.60	<b>.001</b>	58.42	47.28	.074	26.88	27.61	.895

Rapport	77.44	70.30	.332	68.78	71.21	.739	55.28	53.07	.722	25.22	35.72	.059
Realistic Expectations	73.68	77.54	.602	70.03	68.24	.809	53.44	56.46	.626	25.81	32.83	.209
Respectful	72.01	80.75	.235	68.03	72.99	.500	50.90	61.13	.102	25.13	36.17	<b>.047</b>
Sensitive/Persistent	77.76	69.71	.258	69.88	68.60	.857	54.92	53.72	.845	25.85	32.61	.213
Strives to be a better teacher	75.96	73.16	.694	72.60	62.17	.152	49.46	63.78	.021	26.57	29.11	.646
Technologically competent	77.65	69.90	.233	68.99	70.71	.793	55.79	52.13	.509	26.60	28.94	.652
Understanding	74.30	76.34	.732	70.53	67.06	.573	56.74	50.37	.201	27.76	23.28	.329

KW= Kruskal-Wallis test

## **Effect of Teaching Experience**

Table 4.15 displays the comparison of ranking of frequencies among different categories of teaching experience (0-5 years; novice, 6-15 years; intermediate, and above 15 years; expert) for the 28 TBC qualities. Respondents across the three categories agreed on eight qualities, with difference in order, to be the top most important to teaching excellence. Those qualities were 1) knowledgeable about topic, 2) enthusiastic about teaching, 3) promotes critical thinking, 4) effective communicator, 5) creative/interesting, 6) approachable/personable, 7) Encourages/cares for students and, 8) Manages class time.

Comparing mean ranks (using KW Chi square values) showed that there was statistically significant difference among respondents across the three categories, in mean ranks of “confident”, “effective communicator”, “prepared”, “professional”, “promotes discussion”, “realistic expectations”, and “respectful”. Novice faculty ranked “confident” significantly higher than the two other groups. Intermediate faculty ranked “effective communicator” and “professional” significantly higher than other two groups. Both intermediate and expert faculty ranked “prepared” and “promotes discussion” significantly higher than novice faculty. Expert faculty ranked “realistic expectations” and “respectful” significantly higher than other groups.

Table 4.15. Comparison of ranks (sum of frequencies in top 10 categories) and mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities among three levels of faculty teaching experience

Teaching Experience	0-5 years (n=68)			6-15 (n=131)			Above 15 (n=249)			Kruskal -Wallis		
	N	Rank	Mean Rank	n	Rank	Mean Rank	n	Rank	Mean Rank	X <sup>2</sup>	df	Asymp. Sig.
Accessible	34	8	200.76	49	12	239.10	114	8	223.31	4.024	2	.134
Approachable/Personable	41	6	217.38	78	6	218.00	143	6	229.86	.971	2	.615
Authoritative	13	19	225.13	26	19	221.27	47	20	226.03	.119	2	.942
Confident	34	9	197.23	65	8	213.43	92	11	237.77	6.636	2	<b>.036</b>
Creative/Interesting	48	4	216.26	91	4	228.31	167	4	224.75	.392	2	.822
Effective communicator	52	3	212.88	100	3	205.86	163	5	237.48	5.796	2	<b>.055</b>
Encourages/Cares	38	7	215.24	69	7	224.42	118	7	227.07	.449	2	.799
Enthusiastic	56	1	233.28	107	2	210.98	202	2	229.21	2.090	2	.352
Establishes goals	23	13	207.96	41	14	217.73	72	18	232.58	2.451	2	.294
Flexible/open minded	14	17	252.57	34	17	223.51	83	14	217.36	3.986	2	.136
Good listener	12	20	223.48	13	23	239.05	51	19	217.12	2.492	2	.288
Happy/positive/humorous	10	21	208.40	18	20	214.63	25	22	234.09	3.211	2	.201
Humble	5	26	221.38	8	27	230.34	29	21	222.28	.383	2	.826
Knowledgeable	54	2	240.49	119	1	222.65	227	1	221.11	1.323	2	.516
Manages class time	32	10	198.77	62	9	228.03	114	9	229.67	3.190	2	.203
Prepared	16	16	260.29	43	13	216.40	83	15	218.99	6.197	2	<b>.045</b>
Presents current info.	7	25	230.12	8	28	226.48	18	28	221.93	.261	2	.878
Professional	25	11	212.40	60	10	203.47	85	13	238.87	7.154	2	<b>.028</b>
Promotes critical thinking	44	5	228.09	88	5	225.42	177	3	223.04	.091	2	.955
Promotes discussion	19	15	261.85	53	11	219.38	95	10	217.00	6.752	2	<b>.034</b>
Provides const. feedback	10	22	226.43	13	24	219.77	23	27	226.46	.254	2	.881
Rapport	10	23	212.01	12	25	218.39	24	26	231.12	1.624	2	.444
Realistic expectations	14	18	262.40	38	15	235.60	92	12	208.31	10.868	2	<b>.004</b>
Respectful	20	14	236.69	28	18	244.69	81	17	210.55	6.814	2	<b>.033</b>
Sensitive/Persistent	3	28	236.51	14	22	230.27	25	23	218.18	1.552	2	.460
Strives to be a better teacher	25	12	211.81	38	16	231.36	82	16	224.36	1.079	2	.583
Technologically competent	8	24	220.26	18	21	217.74	25	24	229.21	.977	2	.614
Understanding	5	27	232.35	9	26	233.88	25	25	217.42	2.577	2	.276

Table 4.16 displays the mean ranks of TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- and foreign-educated faculty within the three faculty teaching experience categories. There were statistically significant differences between US- vs foreign- educated within faculty's teaching experience in a few qualities. Within novice faculty, there was statistically significant difference between the two groups (US- vs foreign-educated faculty) in four qualities, where foreign-educated faculty ranked "creative/interesting," flexible/open-minded," and "humble" significantly higher, while US-educated faculty ranked "respectful" significantly higher. Within intermediate level, foreign-educated faculty also ranked "encourages/cares" and "understanding" significantly higher. Within expert faculty foreign-educated faculty ranked "confident" and "sensitive/persistent" significantly higher while "and US-educated faculty ranked "enthusiastic" significantly higher than foreign-educated faculty.

Table 4.16. Comparison of mean ranks of the TBC 28 teaching qualities between US- vs foreign-educated faculty within three different levels of teaching experience

Experience	0-5 years				6-15 years				Above 15 years			
	Mean rank		Kruskal -Wallis		Mean rank		Kruskal -Wallis		Mean rank		Kruskal -Wallis	
	US	Foreign	$\chi^2$	Aysmp. Sign.	US	Foreign	$\chi^2$	Aysmp. Sign.	US	Foreign	$\chi^2$	Aysmp. Sign.
	n=38	n=30			n=87	n=44			n=184	n=65		
Accessible	35.93	32.68	.461	.497	68.57	60.91	1.212	.271	125.80	122.75	.087	.768
Approachable/Personable	35.66	33.03	.299	.585	63.49	70.95	1.141	.285	126.39	121.07	.264	.607
Authoritative	38.05	30.00	2.812	.094	65.36	67.27	.076	.783	125.73	122.93	.073	.786
Confident	36.07	32.52	.543	.461	68.00	62.05	.724	.395	130.49	109.46	4.129	<b>.042</b>
Creative/Interesting	40.26	27.20	7.385	<b>.007</b>	63.60	70.74	1.037	.308	120.53	137.66	2.733	.098
Effective communicator	36.87	31.50	1.247	.264	66.84	64.33	.129	.719	129.30	112.83	2.525	.112
Encourages/Cares	35.00	33.87	.055	.814	71.87	54.40	6.222	<b>.013</b>	129.44	112.44	2.691	.101
Enthusiastic	30.80	39.18	3.051	.081	63.85	70.25	.841	.359	119.20	141.42	4.612	<b>.032</b>
Establishes goals	34.22	34.85	.017	.897	64.86	68.25	.234	.628	122.89	130.96	.607	.436
Flexible/open minded	38.70	29.18	3.921	<b>.048</b>	63.27	71.40	1.351	.245	120.91	136.58	2.285	.131
Good listener	34.64	34.32	.005	.945	63.03	71.86	1.605	.205	126.82	119.85	.453	.501
Happy/positive/humorous	38.18	29.83	3.024	.082	66.08	65.84	.001	.973	129.75	111.56	3.095	.079
Humble	39.57	28.08	5.727	<b>.017</b>	63.02	71.89	1.620	.203	129.64	111.85	2.963	.085
Knowledgeable	35.39	33.37	.187	.666	68.98	60.11	1.713	.191	127.07	119.15	.623	.430
Manages class time	34.38	34.65	.003	.956	67.23	63.57	.273	.601	123.53	129.16	.295	.587
Prepared	37.50	30.70	2.002	.157	64.98	68.02	.190	.663	124.68	125.92	.014	.905
Presents current info.	36.70	31.72	1.082	.298	66.58	64.85	.062	.804	126.99	119.37	.546	.460
Professional	33.51	35.75	.216	.642	65.09	67.81	.151	.697	127.08	119.11	.592	.442
Promotes critic. thinking	34.72	34.22	.011	.916	67.10	63.83	.219	.640	124.71	125.82	.011	.915

Promotes discussion	35.45	33.30	.200	.655	64.29	69.39	.533	.466	122.82	131.18	.651	.420
Provides constr. feedback	36.38	32.12	.801	.371	66.97	64.08	.176	.675	122.48	132.14	.886	.347
Rapport	32.61	36.90	.815	.367	63.80	70.35	.913	.339	127.68	117.42	.998	.318
Realistic expectations	33.58	35.67	.193	.661	65.75	66.49	.011	.915	124.57	126.22	.026	.873
Respectful	28.75	41.78	7.415	.006	64.69	68.59	.319	.572	123.12	130.32	.488	.485
Sensitive/Persistent	34.01	35.12	.057	.812	63.90	70.15	.862	.353	130.08	110.63	3.774	<b>.052</b>
Strives to be a better teacher	31.38	38.45	2.199	.138	69.45	59.17	2.277	.131	123.23	130.01	.453	.501
Technologically competent	34.42	34.60	.002	.967	64.13	69.70	.870	.351	128.98	113.75	2.679	.102
Understanding	37.21	31.07	2.687	.101	70.30	57.50	5.715	<b>.017</b>	122.61	131.75	1.108	.293



## SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Nine qualities were selected by both US- and foreign-educated faculty as most important for excellent teaching, however, in slightly different order. Both groups agreed that 1) knowledgeable about topic and 2) enthusiastic about teaching were the top qualities for excellent teaching. They also ranked similarly another 7 qualities as next highest in order. Those included: 3) creative/Interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, 8) manages class time, and 9) accessible. Chi square values from Kruskal- Wallis (KW) test comparing mean rank showed statistically significant difference between the two groups in several qualities, specifically “confident”, “effective communicator,” “encourages/cares,” “happy/positive/humorous,” “enthusiastic,” and “ respectful.”

Both male and female groups also agreed on the first 8 qualities above. However, Chi square values showed a statistically significant difference between male and female faculty in ranking “confident,” “effective communicator,” “humble,” “manages class time,” “creative/interesting,” “flexible/open minded,” and “promotes discussion”. There was a statistically significant difference between males who were US- vs foreign- educated in two qualities (“confident” and “prepared”) and female faculty who were US- vs foreign-educated in four qualities (“enthusiastic,” “prepared,” “respectful,” and “encourages/cares for students”).

Faculty from STEM and Sciences also agreed on same top eight qualities. However, KW Chi square values comparing mean rank showed statistically significant difference between the two groups in “accessible,” “confident,” “ effective communicator,” “happy/positive,” “humble,” “present current information,” and “promotes discussion.” Within STEM there was a significant difference between US-vs foreign-educated faculty in ranking of “confident,”

“encourages/cares,” and “knowledgeable” significantly more important than did US-educated faculty. Similarly within social sciences there was a statistically significant difference in ranking for: “enthusiastic” and “manages class time.”

Faculty with or without prior graduate developmental preparation in teaching also agreed on the same top eight qualities. KW Chi square showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups except for two qualities (“accessible”, and “prepared”). Within those who received prior graduate preparation in teaching, a significant difference between US- and foreign-educated faculty was found in ranking “promotes critical thinking” and “respectful.” In those who did not receive prior graduate preparation in teaching, a significant difference between US- and foreign-educated faculty was found in ranking for: “confident,” “effective communicator,” “encourages/cares,” “happy/positive,” “humble,” and “enthusiastic.”

The four categories of ranks (i.e. professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and others) also agreed on the same 8 qualities, with difference in order, as the top most important qualities to teaching excellence. The KW Chi square values comparing mean rank showed that there were no statistically significant differences among the four categories, except for “encourages/cares for students” and “realistic expectations”. However, among professors, only “encourages/cares” was ranked significantly different between US-and foreign-educated faculty. Among associate professor, “encourages/cares,” “enthusiastic about teaching,” “establishes goals,” and “provides constructive feedback” were ranked differently between the US- and foreign-educated faculty. Among assistant professors, “enthusiastic about teaching” and “effective communicator” were ranked significantly different between US- and foreign-educated faculty. Within the “Other” categories only “respectful” was ranked significantly different between US- and foreign- educated faculty.

The three categories of teaching experience also agreed on same eight qualities, with differences in order, to be the top most important to teaching excellence. KW Chi square values showed a statistically significant difference between the three groups in mean ranks of “confident,” “effective communicator,” “prepared,” “professional,” “promotes discussion,” “realistic expectations,” and “respectful.”

Among novice faculty, there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups (US- vs foreign-educated faculty) except for four qualities, “creative/interesting,” “flexible/open-minded,” “humble,” and “respectful.” Among intermediate faculty (6-15 years of experience), there was no significant difference except in “encourages/cares” and “understanding.” Among expert faculty (15 or more years of teaching) foreign-educated faculty ranked “confident” and “sensitive/persistent” significantly higher, whereas US-educated faculty ranked “enthusiastic” significantly higher than foreign-educated faculty.

## CHAPTER 5:

### SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Chapters one provided an introduction and description of the research problem, and a description of the purpose and significance of the study. Chapter two provided a literature review of research related to the foreign-born faculty and the qualities of effective and excellent teachers. Chapter three covered the design and procedures used to collect and analyze collected data. Chapter four presented the results of statistical analyses of the data and this chapter (five) will present a summary of the study, summary of the results, discussion, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research.

#### **Summary of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to identify key views of international faculty who teach in American universities on what constitutes excellence in teaching based on different demographics. The country where undergraduate education was obtained was used as the major criterion that distinguishes foreign-educated faculty from US-educated faculty. The basic demographic information included: gender, discipline, participation in any graduate developmental programs (such as: Preparing Future Faculty; PFF or Graduate Teaching Assistant Fellows Program; GTAP), and years of teaching experience. Specifically, this study aimed at answering the following research questions:

- 1- What are the perceptions of teaching excellence among foreign-educated faculty who teach in US universities and how do those perceptions differ from native US-educated faculty?

2- Do foreign-educated and US-educated faculty demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, discipline, academic rank, attending faculty preparation programs and years of experience in teaching) have an influence on perceived teaching excellence?

To answer these questions, faculty from 14 different American universities from the SREB (Southern Regional Educational Board) were asked to complete an on-line survey and rank the top 10 out of 28 teacher qualities for excellent teaching from their own perspectives (Buskist et al., 2002). They were specifically asked to hold and drag to the top of the list the most important 10 qualities where item ranked "1" will be the most important, item ranked "2" will be second most important and so on.

The survey link was sent to 5238 faculty members and yielded an 11.6% response rate. The final valid faculty sample consisted of 448 participants, of which 309 (69%) were US-educated and 139 (31%) were foreign educated through their undergraduate education. After collecting data, statistical analyses were performed using descriptive analyses and non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test to compare mean ranks with Chi-square values.

### **Answering Research Question One**

In answering the first research question, results showed that both US- and foreign-educated faculty agreed on nine qualities/behaviors, although in different order, to be the most important for achieving teaching excellence. These qualities were: 1) knowledgeable about topic, 2) enthusiastic about teaching, 3) creative/interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, 8) manages class time, and 9) accessible. "Confident" was ranked 8<sup>th</sup> by foreign-educated, while it was ranked 11<sup>th</sup> by US-educated faculty.

Both groups agreed that number one quality is “knowledgeable” followed by “enthusiastic about teaching.” Many researchers found that knowledge and enthusiasm about teaching have been always associated with effective teaching (Faranda & Clarke , 2004; Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, & James, 2002; Sherman, Armisted, Fowler, Barksdale, & Reif, 1987; Vulcano, 2007; and Yair, 2008). Knowledgeable and enthusiastic about teaching were selected as most important qualities for effective teaching by faculty from a community college (Schaefer et al., 2003) and faculty in general baccalaureate institutions (Buskist et al., 2002; Wann, 2001).

Keeley et al. (2012) reported similar results comparing US and Japanese students, where they agreed on 7 top qualities, four of those were similarly agreed upon by both US- and foreign-educated faculty in this study (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, enthusiastic, and effective communicator). Vulcano (2007), using the TBC, with Canadian undergraduates found that “knowledgeable,” “approachable,” “enthusiastic about teaching,” and “effective communicator” were among the top ten qualities selected by students. These findings offer international support for qualities of effective teaching.

It seems that these two qualities “knowledgeable” and “enthusiastic” are universal principles for achieving excellent teaching as suggested by Buskist et al. (2012) who suggested that (1) knowledge or technical competence and (2) enthusiasm and interpersonal competence are universal principles for achieving excellent teaching that “seem consistently to emerge regardless of educational or geographic setting,” p. # 286).

The current study showed that both US- and foreign-educated faculty agreed on seven qualities as important among the top ten. Those included: 3) creative/interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, 8) manages class time, and 9) accessible.

In their study comparing faculty and students, Schaeffer et al. (2003) showed that students and faculty agreed on 6 of the top 10 qualities and behaviors. Four of those qualities (knowledgeable, approachable/personable, creative/interesting, and enthusiasm) were similarly identified by faculty in this study as commonly important for teaching excellence.

Chi square values from the Kruskal- Wallis (KW) test comparing mean rank showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups in some teaching qualities. Foreign-educated faculty significantly ranked “confident,” “Effective communicator,” “encourages/cares,” and “happy/positive/humorous” significantly higher than did the US-educated faculty. Except for “happy/positive/humorous”, the other three qualities were ranked among top 10 by foreign-educated faculty. A description of these four qualities from the TBC stated:

- Confident (Speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly)
- Effective Communicator (Speaks clearly/loudly; uses precise English; gives clear, compelling examples)
- Encourages and Cares for Students (Provides praise for good student work, helps students who need it, offers bonus points and extra credit, and knows student names)
- Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous (Tells jokes and funny stories, laughs with students)

Looking at the description of those four qualities, it could be concluded that effective teaching is centrally concerned with establishing interpersonal relationships with students. A major challenge for foreign-educated faculty, in this regard maybe the lack of familiarity with the U.S. higher education system and US academic institutional culture (Thomas & Johnson, 2004), lack of English proficiency, and cultural differences (National Research Council, 1988). These challenges represent major concerns for foreign-educated faculty (Park, 2001), requiring

them to spend a substantial amount of time trying to overcome these problems on daily basis (Lee, 2004). These challenges make it more difficult to relate to students in classrooms (Collins, 2008) and may help explain the higher ranking for the above interpersonal qualities of excellent teaching by foreign-educated faculty.

“Enthusiastic” and “respectful” were ranked statistically significantly higher by US-educated faculty, which show more emphasis on enthusiasm in teaching among US-educated faculty.

<b>Qualities ranked significantly higher</b>		
<b>In general</b>	<b>US-educated</b>	<b>Foreign-educated</b>
	“enthusiastic” and  “respectful”	“confident,” “effective communicator,” “encourages/cares,” and “happy/positive/humorous”

## **Answering Research Question Two**

### **Gender Effect:**

In answering the second research question regarding the influence of demographic characteristics on perceived teaching excellence, both male and female groups agreed on eight qualities: 1) knowledgeable about topic, 2) enthusiastic about teaching, 3) creative/interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, and 8) manages class time. “Accessible” and “confident” came in the 9th and 10<sup>th</sup>, respectively by US-educated faculty and 11th and 12th by foreign-educated faculty.

However, KW Chi square values comparing mean rank showed statistically significant differences between the two groups in several qualities. Male faculty significantly ranked “confident,” “effective communicator,” “humble,” and “manages class time” in higher rank than



did the female faculty. Conversely, “creative/interesting,” “flexible/open minded,” and “promotes discussion” were ranked statistically significantly higher by female faculty than by male faculty. Male faculty placed a higher degree of value on certain characteristics on the TBC, while female faculty place higher value on others. This finding is at odds with the results from Buskist et al. (2002), and Schaefer et al. (2003) who showed that there was no appreciable difference in ranking between male and female faculty. The lack of difference in rankings between male and female faculty in those studies may be attributed to the similarity in participants’ educational background.

There was no significant difference between US-and foreign-educated male faculty in the top 9 qualities. However, Foreign-educated male faculty ranked “Confident” and “Prepared” significantly more important than did male US-educated faculty. This finding might indicate that being prepared and confident are valued more by foreign-educated faculty. Lack of confidence is one of the problems that face foreign faculty and could be attributed to many reasons including lack of familiarity with the US culture (Collins, 2008), racial discrimination and bias (Peterson, Friedman, Ash, Franco, & Carr, 2004) as well as language difficulty.

US-educated female faculty gave higher rankings for: “Enthusiastic,” “prepared,” and “respectful”. Based on studies of student evaluations from US universities, Martin (1984) indicated that female faculty are expected to be warm, and friendly, and Feldman (1993) indicated that they are expected to be encouraging of questions. These set of characteristics are related to teacher enthusiasm (Chamberlin & Hickey, 2001). Finding US female faculty valuing enthusiasm in higher rank in this study is in congruence with what was indicated by Martin (1984) and Feldman (1993).

Qualities ranked significantly higher		
In general	US-educated	Foreign-educated
<b>Male</b> “confident,” “effective communicator” “humble” “manages class time/punctuality”		“confident” “prepared”
<b>Female</b> “creative/interesting” “flexible/open minded” “promotes discussion”	“enthusiastic” “prepared” “respectful”	

### Discipline Effect

Faculty from both STEM and Social Sciences agreed on same top eight qualities for excellent teaching, but in different order. Same eight qualities, as agreed on by male and female in general, included 1) knowledgeable about topic, 2) enthusiastic about teaching, 3) creative/interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, and 8) manages class time. Both groups ranked “knowledgeable” and number one on top followed by “enthusiastic”.

However, KW Chi square values showed that STEM faculty significantly ranked “accessible,” “confident,” “effective communicator,” “happy/positive,” “humble,” and “present current information” in significantly higher rank than did Social Sciences faculty. Many professors in STEM use the transmission model of teaching (i.e. lecture) which has been categorized as holding that students’ minds are empty vessels that need to be filled with information supplied by the professor (Harkness, 2011). The common use of transmission model may explain the greater emphasis by STEM faculty on “effective communication” and “presenting current information.” Social Sciences faculty ranked “promotes discussion” statistically significantly higher, indicating more value for this quality.

Within STEM, foreign-educated faculty ranked “confident,” “encourages/cares,” and “knowledgeable” significantly more important than did US-educated faculty. Theobald (2007) indicated that foreign-born faculty interact with institutions, department colleagues, and students somewhat differently, due to their different cultural background. In addition, Mamiseishvili (2011) stated that although they excel in research, international faculty often struggle with their teaching obligations. Therefore, the issue of confidence maybe attributed to many of those challenges that foreign-faculty have to deal with and this may make it more of a critical issue, especially in the STEM field where the research is more intensive, leaving less time for teaching (Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, 1998).

US-educated faculty from social sciences significantly ranked “enthusiastic” and “manages class time” higher, which indicated more value of these two qualities to faculty in social sciences.

<b>Qualities ranked significantly higher</b>		
<b>In general</b>	<b>US-educated</b>	<b>Foreign-educated</b>
<b>stem</b> “accessible” “confident” “effective communicator” “happy/positive” “humble” “present current information”		“confident” “encourages/cares” “knowledgeable”
<b>social sciences</b> “promotes discussion”	“enthusiastic” “manages class time/ punctuality”	

## **Effect of Prior Graduate Developmental Program**

There was almost no (only differed in 2 qualities) significant differences between those faculty who received graduate preparation and those who did not in ranking the qualities of excellent teaching. Nevertheless, both groups ranked nine qualities, with a different order, as most important. These included: 1) knowledgeable about topic, 2) enthusiastic about teaching, 3) creative/interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, 8) manages class time and 9) confident. The first eight qualities were agreed upon by both US- and foreign-educated faculty, males and female faculty and between STEM and social sciences.

However, when it was broken down by location of undergraduate education, significant differences were identified, especially among faculty who had no prior preparation in teaching. Five qualities were ranked higher by foreign-educated faculty who had no prior graduate preparation in teaching, including “confident,” “effective communicator,” “encourages/cares,” “happy/positive,” and “humble,” while US-educated faculty with no prior preparation in teaching gave significantly higher ranking for “enthusiastic”. Three qualities “confident,” “effective communicator,” and “encourages/cares” were among the top 10 qualities ranked by faculty in general. However, foreign-educated faculty with no prior preparation in teaching ranked those higher and more important to excellent teaching, which may indicate that foreign education and lack of prior preparation in teaching has an effect on the perception of foreign faculty about qualities of excellent teaching. This finding also allude to the value of prior preparation programs in providing graduate students with the confidence and effective communication skills required for the faculty teaching job.

<b>Qualities ranked significantly higher</b>		
<b>In general</b>	<b>US-educated</b>	<b>Foreign-educated</b>
<b>Prior Preparation in Teaching</b>	“promotes critical thinking”	“respectful”
<b>No Prior Preparation in Teaching</b> “accessible” “prepared”	“enthusiastic”	“confident” “effective communicator” “encourages/cares” “happy/positive” “humble”

### **Academic Rank Effect**

Respondents across the four categories of academic rank (i.e. professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and others) agreed on nine qualities, with differences in order, to be the most important to teaching excellence. Those qualities were: 1) knowledgeable about topic, 2) enthusiastic about teaching, 3) promotes critical thinking, 4) effective communicator, 5) creative/interesting, 6) approachable/personable, 7) manages class time, 8) encourages/cares for students, and 9) confident. The first eight qualities were agreed upon by both US- and foreign-educated faculty, male and female faculty, STEM and social sciences faculty and faculty who received prior graduate developmental preparation or did not. KW Chi square values comparing mean rank showed that there were no statistically significant difference among the four categories, except for “encourages/cares for students” (ranked higher by “other”) and “realistic expectations” (ranked higher by professors).

Full professors ranked “realistic expectations of students/fair testing and grading” significantly higher than the other three groups. The descriptor of “realistic expectation” involved (Covers material to be tested during class, writes relevant test questions, does not overload students with reading, teaches at an appropriate level for the majority of students in the course, curves grades when appropriate). From this description, we can see that they involve

more mature thinking about teaching and learning and that may explain the significantly higher ranking by professors who have been in the academia and teaching for a long time.

There were statistically significant differences between US- vs foreign- educated within faculty ranks in a few qualities. Only “encourages/cares” was ranked significantly higher by US-educated professors compared to foreign-educated professor. Carliner (2000) stated that the more years those foreign-born scientists spend living the US, the differences between them and the native-born scientists diminish. The more they experience the culture and the language and receive more support, the less the significant the difference become (Li et al., 2012).

Foreign-educated assistant professor ranked “effective communication” significantly higher than US-educated assistant professors. As new assistant professors, foreign-educated faculty gave greater value to effective communication as it might be one of the major problems they have to face in their early career. It could be concluded from these results that there is a clear trend of valuing of interpersonal skills among foreign-educated faculty compared to US-educated faculty. On the other hand, US-educated assistant and associate professors ranked “enthusiastic” significantly higher than foreign-educated faculty, which was a common trend with US-educated faculty in general.

<b>Qualities ranked significantly higher</b>		
<b>In general</b>	<b>US-educated</b>	<b>Foreign-educated</b>
<b>Professor</b> “realistic expectations”		“encourages/cares”
<b>Associate professor</b>	“enthusiastic about teaching” “establishes goals” “provides constructive feedback”	“encourages/cares”
<b>Assistant professor</b>	“enthusiastic about teaching”	“effective communicator”
<b>Other</b> “encourages/cares for students”	“respectful”	

## Effect of Teaching Experience

Faculty in the three categories of teaching experience [novice (0-5 years), intermediate (6-15 years), and expert (above 15 years)] agreed on eight qualities, with difference in order, to be the most important to teaching excellence. Those qualities were. 1) knowledgeable about topic, 2) enthusiastic about teaching, 3) promotes critical thinking, 4) effective communicator, 5) creative/interesting, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students and 8) manages class time.

The KW Chi square showed that novice faculty ranked “confident” higher, which is probably because they are early in their career and they need to work hard towards gaining confidence. Intermediate faculty ranked “effective communicator” and “professional” higher, and along with expert faculty they both ranked “prepared” and “promotes discussion” significantly higher than novice faculty. Expert faculty ranked “realistic expectations” and “respectful” significantly higher than the other two groups.

<b>Qualities ranked significantly higher</b>		
<b>In general</b>	<b>US-educated</b>	<b>Foreign-educated</b>
<b>0-5 years; novice</b> “confident”	“respectful”	“creative/interesting” “flexible/open-minded” “humble”
<b>6-15; intermediate</b> “effective communicator” “professional” “prepared” “promotes discussion”		encourages/cares” “understanding”
<b>Above 15 years; expert</b> “prepared” “promotes discussion” “realistic expectations” “respectful”	“enthusiastic”	“confident” “sensitive/persistent”

Kugel (1993) provided a good explanation for the above result in his article “How Professors Develop as Teachers.” Kugel, based on informal observation, described how the teaching abilities of college professor develop in different stages. At the first stage (Stage I: self) when they begin to focus more on own role in the classroom and how they could survive the classroom experience with little or no teaching experience. This problem could be even more pronounced with foreign-faculty and may explain the ranking for “confidence” by the novice faculty, in general, significantly higher than intermediate and expert faculty.

In the second stage, they focus more on the subject and covering the content they are teaching (Stage 2: subject) and then on students as absorbent learners (Stage 3: student as receptive) shifting focus from teaching to learning. This idea also may explain the higher ranking for “effective communicator,” “professional,” “prepared,” and “promotes discussion” by intermediate faculty.

Expert faculty ranked “realistic expectations” significantly higher than the other groups. “Expert” categories involve teaching for longer periods of time (15 to 56 years in this study). From the description of this quality, we can see that it involves more mature thinking about teaching and learning and more understanding of students’ needs which come with experience and long years of teaching.

Foreign-educated faculty in general ranked “confident” and “sensitive” (by experts), “encourages/cares” and “understanding” (by intermediate) or “creative/interesting”, “flexible/open-minded” and “humble” (by novice) significantly higher than US-educated faculty. These qualities show more focus of foreign-educated faculty on confidence and interpersonal attributes. On the other hand, “enthusiastic” was ranked significantly higher by expert US-educated faculty compared to expert foreign-educated faculty.



## Conclusion

From the above discussion, it could be concluded that eight qualities of excellent teaching were universally agreed upon by US- and foreign-educated faculty, although in different order. These qualities/behaviors were: 1) knowledgeable about topic, 2) enthusiastic about teaching, 3) creative/interesting, 4) promotes critical thinking, 5) effective communicator, 6) approachable/personable, 7) encourages/cares for students, 8) manages class time/punctuality. “Knowledgeable” and “enthusiastic” were ranked number 1 and 2 top qualities. Demographic characteristics of faculty did not affect the selection of those qualities to be the top eight qualities; however the order of some qualities was statistically significantly different between US- and foreign educated faculty and within the different demographic characteristics. Foreign-educated faculty tended to rank “confident” and interpersonal attributes such as (effective communicator, encourages and cares) significantly higher than US-educated faculty within different demographics. US-educated faculty ranked “enthusiastic about teaching” significantly higher than foreign-educated faculty within different demographics (See table below).

US-educated faculty and foreign-educated faculty don’t view qualities of excellent teaching all differently. Yet, the difference in the importance of those qualities reflects their unique perspectives of excellent teaching and what is most central to their teaching process.

<b>Qualities ranked significantly higher</b>		
<b>In general</b>	<b>US-educated</b>	<b>Foreign-educated</b>
	“enthusiastic” “respectful”	“confident” “effective communicator” “encourages/cares” “happy/positive/humorous”
<b>Male</b> “confident” “effective communicator” “humble” “manages class time/punctuality		“confident” “prepared”
<b>female</b>	“enthusiastic”	

“creative/interesting” “flexible/open minded” “promotes discussion”	“prepared” “respectful”	
<b>STEM</b> “accessible” “confident” “effective communicator” “happy/positive” “humble” “present current information”		“confident” “encourages/cares” “knowledgeable”
<b>Social Sciences</b> “promotes discussion”	“enthusiastic” “manages class time”	
<b>PFF</b>	“promotes critical thinking”	“respectful”
<b>No PFF</b> “accessible” “prepared”	“enthusiastic”	“confident”, “effective communicator”, “encourages/cares”, “happy/positive and “humble”
<b>Professor</b> “realistic expectations”		“encourages/cares”
<b>Associate professor</b>	“enthusiastic “ “establishes goals” “provides constructive feedback”	“encourages/cares”
<b>Assistant professor</b>	“enthusiastic about teaching”	“effective communicator”
<b>Other</b> “Encourages/cares for students”	“respectful”	
<b>0-5 years; novice,</b> “confident”	“respectful”	“creative/interesting” “flexible/open-minded” “humble”
<b>6-15; intermediate</b> “effective communicator” “professional” “prepared” “promotes discussion”		“encourages/cares” “understanding”
<b>Above 15 years; expert</b> “prepared” “promotes discussion” “realistic expectations” “respectful”	“enthusiastic”	“confident” “sensitive/persistent”

## **Limitations**

This study used the TBC (Buskist et al., 2002) in an online setting, which yielded a low response rate from faculty (11.6 %) with about one third of those were foreign-educated faculty. The study also sampled faculty from only the SREB (Southern Regional Educational Board). Therefore the findings may not reflect the beliefs of t faculty beliefs in other regions. The sample also focused only on academic institutions categorized as high or very research-intensive (according to Carnegie Foundation classification). The study was conducted during one semester (Spring 2014). Due to all the above, there might be limitations on generalizing the findings of this study. Extending the study to a broader range of geographical regions and institutions with different levels of research intensity may yield more generalizable data.

## **Implications for Practice**

### **Contributions to the Literature**

This study significantly contributes to the current literature on qualities/behavior of excellent teaching by shedding more light on what foreign-educated faculty value in excellent teaching compared to US-educated faculty. This study provides a rare empirical view of institutions of higher education by improving understanding of the differences between foreign-educated and US-educated faculty and by providing a theoretical explanation for understanding this difference.

In contrast to what one might expect, foreign-educated faculty's views about what constitutes excellent teaching is not generally different from US-educated faculty. The current study demonstrated that both US-educated and foreign-educated faculty identified similar characteristics of excellent teaching. These characteristics were consistent with research results reviewed in Chapter 2. This study has demonstrated that faculty members, regardless of the

nature of their country of undergraduate education, perceive certain characteristics that should be associated with excellent teaching. Both groups agreed, consistent with the literature, that knowledge and enthusiasm are the most important qualities for excellent teaching. In addition, because both US-educated and foreign-educated faculty valued the same top eight qualities/behaviors of excellent teachers, it would be expected that reflection of these views on their student learning would be somewhat similar between the two groups.

The TBC distinguished between US-educated and foreign-educated faculty mean ranks within demographic characteristics. Therefore, continuing use of this instrument for assessing different group perceptions within instructional settings is recommended for further studies.

### **Implications for Administrators in Academic Institutions/Teaching Centers**

Foreign-educated faculty may start their academic career slow, primarily because of many challenges and disadvantages they face in the beginning of their academic lives, resulting in a slower pace of adaption to the US academy. However, with longer exposure to the US academic culture, they tend to overcome those challenges as they advance in their career and the differences between them and US-educated faculty diminish. Therefore the greater level of personal and professional support they can get at their early career the faster they are able to adapt and fit in.

Foreign-educated faculty tended to rank “confident” and interpersonal attributes such as (effective communicator, encourages and cares) significantly higher than US-educated faculty within different demographics. Their focus on these qualities indicates higher priorities to foreign-educated faculty. These findings yield important implications for administrators in academic institutions who are in charge of faculty development or teacher education for new faculty scholars who received their undergraduate education in a foreign country.

Most faculty development programs (such as new faculty scholars, professional development seminars or certificate in college teaching programs) are designed for general faculty and not specifically for foreign-educated faculty. Tailoring special programs for foreign-educated faculty that focus more on interpersonal skills and overcoming the academic culture gap may be necessary. As a matter of fact, such programs should be also tailored toward foreign graduate students before they join the professoriate. Communication skills, presentation skills, and orientation to teaching in US classes are but a few examples of relevant components of such programs.

Additionally, it might be worth considering assigning a full-time US-educated faculty mentor, who can provide support and specific instruction about teaching, as well as specific academic institute orientation, to foreign-educated faculty in their early career. This strategy would be especially critical for newly appointed foreign-educated faculty who had little or no teaching experience during their graduate studies (mostly serving as graduate research assistants).

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

This study's findings are congruent with the literature about qualities of excellent teaching in general (e.g. Buskist et al., 2002; Collins, 1990; Faranda and Clarke; 2004). However, to be able to generalize the specific findings about foreign-educated faculty's values of certain qualities/behaviors, further examination of a larger sample in more diverse settings within the US is needed. Follow-up studies should be conducted throughout the US and with institutions with different teaching and research foci. A longitudinal approach for data collection, rather than a single data collection point, is also recommended. Such an approach

would help compare changes in faculty views from one career stage to another (i.e. from assistant through full professorship) and determine if their views change over time.

Another recommended further study would be to use a mixed data collection method, by including interviews with faculty who achieved excellence in teaching (as documented by receiving teaching awards) in their discipline. Additionally, further studies on the correlation between perceptions of excellent teaching and student learning between US- and foreign-educated faculty, is also recommended.

The use of Kruskal-Wallis test was very useful in comparing the rankings among the different groups and thus it is recommended to use it for data similar to those collected in the present study. The use of mean rankings from TBC was successful in discriminating among different groups and therefore it is recommended to continue using this tool in measuring the qualities of excellent teaching at different academic teaching settings.

### **Summary**

This study aimed to identify key views of foreign-educated faculty who teach in American universities on what constitutes excellent teaching based on different demographics. Faculty from different SREB (Southern Regional Educational Board) intuitions were asked complete an on-line survey (Teacher Behavior Checklist) by ranking the top 10 of 28 qualities for excellent teaching from their own perspectives (Buskist et al., 2002).

Eight qualities of excellent teaching were universally agreed upon by US- and foreign-educated faculty, although in different order. Demographic characteristics of faculty did not affect the selection of those qualities; however, the order of some qualities was statistically significantly different between US- and foreign educated faculty within the different demographic characteristics. Foreign-educated faculty tended to rank “confident,” “effective

communicator,” and “encourages and cares” significantly higher than us-educated faculty within different demographics. US-educated faculty ranked “enthusiastic about teaching” significantly higher than Foreign-educated faculty within different demographics. This study provides a significant contribution to the literature on qualities of excellent teaching among foreign-educated faculty as well as important information for administrators in higher education institutions who are in charge of faculty development.

## REFERENCES

- Alberts, H. (2008). The challenges and opportunities of foreign-born instructors in the classroom. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32(2), 189-203.
- Allen, W.R., Epps, E., Guillory, E., Suh, S., & Bonous-Hammarth, M. (2000). The Black academic: Faculty status among African Americans in U.S. higher education. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69, 112-127.
- Alshare, K. A. & Miller, D. S. (2009). Student perceptions of the importance of instructor traits: a cross-cultural study. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 13 (2), 107-134.
- Altbach, P. G. (2005). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *The NEA 2005 Almanac of Higher Education*, 63-74.
- Altbach, P. G. (2006). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *The NEA 2006 Almanac of Higher Education*, 27-36.
- Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 77(3/4), 290-205.
- Altbach, P.G., R.O Berdahl, and P.J. Gumport. (2005). *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(5), 582–602.
- Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Baird, J. R., Fensham, P. J. Gunstone R. F. & White R. T.( 1991) The importance of reflection in improving science teaching and learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 28 (2) 163–182.
- Balam, E.M. (2006). *Professors' teaching effectiveness in relation to self-efficacy beliefs and perceptions of student rating myths* (Doctoral dissertation), Auburn University, Alabama, USA. Retrieved from: <http://etd.auburn.edu/etd/>.
- Barnes, D. C., Engelland, Brian T., Matherne, C. F., Martin, W. C., Orgeron, C.P., Ring, J. K., Smith, G.R. & Williams, Z. (2008). Developing a psychometrically sound measure of collegiate teaching proficiency. *College Student Journal*, 42 (1), 199-213.



Basti, C. F. (1996). *A study of the professorate from the perspective of selective foreign-born faculty*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9716530).

Berget, R.J., Reynolds, C.F. Ricci, E.M., Quinn, S.C., Mawson, A.R., Payton, M., Thomas, S.B. (2010). A plan to facilitate the early career development of minority scholars in the health sciences. *Soc. Work Public Health*.25 (6):572-90. doi: 10.1080/19371911003748174.

Boice, R. (1992). *The New Faculty Member*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco, Calif, USA.

Bonwell, C., & Eison, J. (1991). *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1). Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Borjas, G. (2000). Foreign-born teaching assistants and the academic performance of undergraduates. NBER Working Paper No. W7635, Harvard University. Available at [http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~GBorjas/Papers/Foreign-Born\\_Teaching\\_Assistants.pdf](http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~GBorjas/Papers/Foreign-Born_Teaching_Assistants.pdf)

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University (1998). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities*. Stony Brook, NY: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bradford, C. (1990). Why droves of foreign profs toil in U.S. groves. *The Wall Street Journal*, March 29, A12.

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010). *Employment and total job openings by postsecondary education and training category*. Available at <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/>

Buskist, W. (2004). Ways of master teacher. Special to the Observer, *Association for Psychological Science*, 17 (9) 23-26. Retrieved from: <http://www.psychologicalscience.org/index.php/uncategorized/ways-of-the-master-teacher.html>

Buskist, W. (in preparation). *The seven keys to excellence in teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Buskist, W., Sikorski, J., Buckley, T., & Saville, B. K. (2002). Elements of master teaching. In S. F. Davis & W. Buskist (Eds.), *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer* (pp. 27-39). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Butner, B., Burley, H., & Marbley, A.F. (2000). Coping with the unexpected: Black faculty at predominantly White institutions. *Journal of Black Studies*, 30 (3), 453-462.

Carliner, G. (2000). The language ability of U.S. immigrants: Assimilation and cohort effects. *International Migration Review*, 34 (1): 158-183.

Carson, B. H. (1996) 'Thirty years of stories: the professor's place in student memories'. *Change* 28 (6) pp10-17.

Cashin, W.E. (1989). *Student Ratings of Teaching: Recommendations for Use*. IDEA Paper No. 22. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

Chamberlin, M.S. & Hickey, J.S. (2001). Student evaluations of faculty performance: the role of gender expectations in differential evaluations. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 25 (2), 3-15.

Chaudhury, S.R. (2011). The lecture. In J.E. Groccia, & W. Buskist (Eds.), *Need for evidence-based teaching. New directions for Teaching and learning*, no. 128. Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

Chickering, W. & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 39 (7), 3-7.

Clayton, M. (2000). Foreign teaching assistants' first test: the accent. *Christian Science Monitor*, 92(5 June), p. 14. Available at <http://www.csmonitor.com/2000/0905/p14s1.html>

Collins, A. (1990). Transforming the assessment of teachers: Notes on a theory of assessment for the 21st century. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Catholic Education Association, Boston, MA.

Collins, J. M. (2008). Coming to America: Challenges for Faculty Coming to United States Universities. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32: 2, 179 - 188. DOI: 10.1080/03098260701731215. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03098260701731215>.

Corley, E. A., & Sabharwal, M. (2007). Foreign-born academic scientists and engineers: Producing more and getting less than their U.S.-born peers? *Research in Higher Education*, 48 (8), 909–940

Craven, R. (1996). *Teaching the teachers Indigenous Australian studies*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.

De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishers.

Devlin, M., & Samarawickrema, G. (2010). The criteria of effective teaching in a changing higher education context. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 29 (2), 111–124.

Dongbin, K, Wolf-Wendel, L. & Twombly, S. (2011). International Faculty: Experiences of Academic Life and Productivity in U.S. Universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82, 6, pp. 720-747. DOI: 10.1353/jhe.2011.0038. Retrieved from: [http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal\\_of\\_higher\\_education/summary/v082/82.6.kim.html](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_higher_education/summary/v082/82.6.kim.html).

Dunkin, M. (1995). Concepts of teaching and teaching excellence in higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 14, 21–33.

Eble, K.E. (1983). *The aims of college teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Faranda, W., & Clarke, I. (2004). Student observations of outstanding teaching: Implications for marketing educators. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26,271-281.
- Feldman, K.A. (1986). The perceived instructional effectiveness of college teachers as related to their personality and attitude characteristics. *Research in Higher Education* 24, 129-213.
- Feldman, K. A. (1992). College students' view of male and female college teachers: Part I Evidence from the social laboratory and experiments. *Research in Higher Education*, 33, 317-375.
- Feldman, K.A. (1993). College students' views of male and female college teachers: part II. Evidence from students' evaluations of their classroom teachers. *Research in Higher Education*, 34(2), 151–211.
- Feldman, K. A. (1997). Identifying exemplary teachers and teaching: Evidence from student ratings. In P. R. Perry & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *Effective teaching in higher education: Research and practice*. New York: Agathon Press.
- Fenelon J. ( 2003). Race, research and tenure: institutional credibility and the incorporation of African, Latino and American Indian faculty. *J of Black Studies*, 34:87–100.
- Fink, L. D. (1992). Orientation programs for new faculty. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty* (New directions for teaching and learning, No. 48). San Francisco, CA, Jossey Bass.
- Fleming, N (2003). Establishing Rapport: Personal Interaction and Learning. IDEA paper No. 39. The IDEA Center, Manhattan, KS.
- Foote, K. E. (2010). Creating a community of support for graduate students and early career academics. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 34, 1, 7–19.
- Foote, K., Li, W., Monk, J., & Theobald, R. (2008). Foreign-born scholars in U.S. universities: Issues, concerns, and strategies. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32(2), 167-178.
- Freyd, M. (1923). A graphic rating scale for teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 8(5),433-439.
- Gadzella, B. M., Tomcala, M., Fullwood, H. L., Lytton, C. R., & Benton, F. E. (1992). A comparison of students' perceptions of an ideal professor. Paper presented at the Southwestern Psychological Association, Austin, TX. Retrieval at: <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED347879>
- Gahungu A. (2011). Integration of Foreign-Born Faculty in Academia: Foreignness as an Asset. *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6 (1). 1-22.
- Gay, L.R. (1976). *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and application*, Columbus, OH: Merrill publishing Company.

Groccia, J.E. & Buskist, W. (2011). Need for evidence-based teaching. *New directions for Teaching and learning*, no. 128. Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

Groccia, J. E., & Hunter, M. S. (2012). *The first-year seminar: Designing, implementing and assessing courses to support student learning and success: Vol. II. Instructor training and development*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience & Students in Transition.

Groccia, J. E. (2007). Understanding and using student evaluations to improve your teaching. Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, Auburn University. Retrieved from: <http://wp.auburn.edu/biggio/preparing-to-teach-at-auburn/>

Handbook of Biological Statistics (2009). Retrieved from: <http://udel.edu/~mcdonald/statkruskalwallis.html>

Harkness, S.S. (2012). Effective instruction for stem disciplines: From learning theory to college teaching. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 12 (1) 90 – 92.

Hativa, N., Barak, R., & Simhi, E. (2001). Exemplary university teachers: Knowledge and beliefs regarding effective teaching dimensions and strategies. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72 (6), 699-729.

Hill, Y., Lomas, L., & MacGregor, J. (2003) Students' perceptions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11 (1), 15-20.

Hoffer, T., Hess, M. Welch, V., & Williams, K. (2006). Doctorate recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report. Retrieved from: [www.norc.org/projects/survey\\_of\\_earned\\_doctorates.htm](http://www.norc.org/projects/survey_of_earned_doctorates.htm).

Hollmann, F. W. 1993. *U.S. Population Estimates, by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1980 to 1991*. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, P25-1095. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Horn, A. S., Hendel, D. D., & Fry, G. W. (2007). Ranking the international dimension of top research universities in the United States. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (3/4), 330–358.

Hser, M. P. (2005). Campus internationalization: A study of American universities' internationalization efforts. *International Education*, 35(1), 35–48.

Institute of International Education (2011). Fall Survey Data: Continued Growth in International Students Enrollments in the U.S. Retrieved from: <http://www.iie.org/en/>

Ismail, E., Buskist, W., & Groccia, J. E. (2012). Peer review of teaching. In M. Kite (Ed.), *Effective evaluation of teaching: A guide for faculty and administrators*. Retrieval at the Society for the Teaching of Psychology Homepage: <http://www.teachpsych.org/resources/e-books>.

Johnson, J. M. (2006). International mobility of doctoral recipients from U. S. universities. Paper presented at Council of Graduate Schools Annual Meeting, December, New Orleans, LA.

Jowaisas, D. (2004). Measuring and Developing Effective Teaching-The Role of Student Evaluations Sabbatical Report, Department of Psychology, Oklahoma City University.

Keeley, J. W. (2012). Choosing an Instrument for student evaluation of instruction. In M. Kite (Ed.), *Effective evaluation of teaching: A guide for faculty and administrators*. Retrieval at the Society for the Teaching of Psychology: <http://www.teachpsych.org/resources/e-books>.

Keeley, J., Christopher, A., & Buskist, W. (2012). Emerging evidence for excellent teaching across borders. Book chapter in Groccia, J. E., Alsudairi, M.A.T., & Buskist, W. (Eds.). *The handbook of college and university teaching: A global perspective* (pp 374-390). Los Angeles: Sage Publishing.

Keeley, J., Furr, R. M., & Buskist, W. (2010). Differentiating Psychology Students' Perceptions of Teachers Using the Teacher Behavior Checklist. *Teaching of Psychology*, 37, 16-20.

Keeley, J., Smith, D., & Buskist, W. (2006). The Teacher Behaviors Checklist: Factor analysis of its utility for evaluating teaching. *Teaching of Psychology*, 33, 84-90.

Kentucky Department of Education (2013). Characteristics of Highly Effective Teaching and Learning (CHETL). Retrieved from: <http://education.ky.gov/curriculum/docs/pages/characteristics-of-highly-effective-teaching-and-learning-%28chetl%29.aspx>

Khrabrova, I.M. (2011). *A cultural approach to understanding professional experiences of foreign-born faculty in U.S. educational leadership preparation programs*. Doctoral Dissertation, Old Dominion University.

Kim, D., Wolf-Wendel, L., & Twombly, S. (2011). International Faculty: Experiences of Academic Life and Productivity in U.S. Universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82, 6, 720-747, The Ohio State University Press. DOI: 10.1353/jhe.2011.0038

Kreber, C. (2002). Teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and the scholarship of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 27(1), 5-23.

Kugel, P. (1993). How Professors Develop as Teachers. *Studies in Higher Education*, 18, No. 3, 315-328.

Kukla-Acevedo, S. (2008). *Teacher effectiveness: the roles of Teacher characteristics, preparation, and turnover* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Kentucky. Available at: [http://uknowledge.uky.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1618&context=gradschool\\_diss](http://uknowledge.uky.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1618&context=gradschool_diss)

Laden, B.V., & Hagedorn, L.S. (2000). Job satisfaction among faculty of color in academe: Individual survivors or institutional transformers. In L. Hagedorn (Ed.), *New directions for institutional research*, 05 (pp.57-66). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Lee, S. (2004). *Foreign-born scientists in the United States –do they perform differently than native-born scientists?* (Doctoral Dissertation), Georgia Institute of Technology. Available at: [http://archive.cspo.org/rvm/publications/pubs\\_docs/lee\\_soohe\\_200412\\_phd.pdf](http://archive.cspo.org/rvm/publications/pubs_docs/lee_soohe_200412_phd.pdf)
- Levy, G. D., & Peters, W. W. (2002). Undergraduates' views of best college courses. *Teaching of Psychology, 29* (1), 45-47.
- Li, C., Wall, S. Loy, M., & Schoonaert, K. (2012), supporting international faculty: Perspectives from administrators, peers, and an “adapted” tiger teacher. *To Improve the Academy, 31*, 247-260
- Lin, Z., Pearce, R., & Wang, W. (2009). Imported talents: demographic characteristics, achievement and job satisfaction of foreign born full time faculty in four-year American colleges. *High Education, 57*:703–721. DOI 10.1007/s10734-008-9171-z.
- Lindbeck, R. & Darnell, D. (2008). An investigation of new faculty orientation and support among mid-sized colleges and universities. *Academic Leadership, 6*, no. 3.
- Liu, M. C. (2001). *The adaptation and experience of foreign-born faculty members in the United States* (Doctoral Dissertation), Claremont Graduate University.
- Long, J. D., & Sparks, W. L. (1997). Behaviors perceived as facilitating or inhibiting the Teaching learning process. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 24*, 196-201.
- Mamiseishvili, K. (2010). Foreign-born women faculty work roles and productivity at research universities in the United States. *Higher Education, 60*, 139-156. doi:10.1007/s10734-009-9291-0.
- Mamiseishvili, K. (2011). Teaching workload and satisfaction of foreign-born and U.S.-born faculty at four-year postsecondary institutions in the United States. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 4* (3), 163-174.
- Mamiseishvili, K., & Rosser, V. J. (2010). International and citizen faculty in the United States: An examination of their productivity at research universities. *Research in Higher Education, 51*, 88-107. doi:10.1007/s11162-009-9145-8.
- Manrique, C. G., & Manrique, G. G. (1999). *The multicultural or immigrant faculty in American society*. Lewiston, NY : The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Marsh, H.W. (1982). SEEQ: A reliable, valid, and useful instrument for collecting students' evaluations of university teaching. *British Journal Educational Psychology, 52*, 77-95. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8279.1982.tb02505.x.
- Martin, E. (1984). Power and Authority in the Classroom: Sexist Stereotypes in Teaching Evaluations. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 9* (3):482–92.
- Marvasti, A. (2005). U.S. academic institutions and perceived effectiveness of foreign born faculty. *Journal of Economic Issues, 39* (1), 151–176.

McCarthy, M. (2012). Using student feedback as one measure of faculty teaching effectiveness. In M. Kite (Ed.), *Effective evaluation of teaching: A guide for faculty and administrators*. Retrievable at the Society for the Teaching of Psychology Homepage: <http://www.teachpsych.org/resources/e-books>.

McKeachie, W. J. (1997). Student ratings: The validity of use. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1218-1225.

McKeachie, W. J. (2002). *McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers* (11th ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Mentkowski, M. & Associates (2000). *Learning that Lasts: Integrating Learning, Development, and Performance in College and Beyond*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyers, C. and Jones, T.B. (1993). *Promoting Active Learning: Strategies for the College Classroom*. Jossey-Bass.

Minor, L.C., Onwuegbuzie, A.J., Witcher, A.E., & James, T.L. (2002). Pre service teachers' educational beliefs and their perceptions of characteristics of effective teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(2), 116-127.

Murray, H.G. (1985). Classroom teaching behaviors related to college teaching effectiveness. In J.G. Donald & A.M. Sullivan (Eds.), *Using research to improve teaching*, (pp. 21-34). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Murray, H. G., Rushton, P. J. and Paunonen, S. (1990). Teacher personality traits and student instructional ratings in six types of university courses. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 42(2): 250-261.

Murray, H.G. (1987). Acquiring student feedback that improves instruction. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 32, 85-96. doi:10.1002/tl.37219873210.

NAFSA: The Association of International Educators. (2006). Restoring U.S. competitiveness for international students and scholars. Retrieved, from NAFSA web site: [http://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA\\_Home/Resource\\_Library\\_Assets/Public\\_Policy/restoring\\_u.s.pdf?n=8823](http://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/NAFSA_Home/Resource_Library_Assets/Public_Policy/restoring_u.s.pdf?n=8823)

Naftulin, D. H., Ware, J. E., & Donnelly, F. A. (1973). The Doctor Fox lecture: A paradigm of educational seduction. *Journal of Medical Education*, 48, 630-635.

National Center for Education Statistics (2008, October). Digest of education statistics 2008. U.S. Department of Education: Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved from NCES web site <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/2006179.pdf>.

National Center for Education Statistics (2010). National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Design. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/nsopf/design.asp>

National Research Council (1988). *Foreign and Foreign-born Engineers in the United States: Infusing Talent, Raising Issues*, Office of Scientific and Engineering Personnel (OSEP). Washington DC: National Academy Press.

Neves, J.S., & Sanyal, R. N.(1991).Classroom communication and teaching effectiveness: the foreign-born instructor. *Journal of Education for Business*, 66 (5), 304-308.

Nulty, D.D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. 33 (3), 301–314.DOI: 10.1080/02602930701293231

O'Meara, K.T. (2007). *Characteristics of effective teachers in the air force's squadron officer college* (Doctoral Dissertation), Department of Educational Foundation, Leadership and Technology, College of Education, Auburn University. Retrievable at: [http://etd.auburn.edu/bitstream/handle/10415/874/O%27MEARA\\_KEVIN\\_50.pdf?sequence=1](http://etd.auburn.edu/bitstream/handle/10415/874/O%27MEARA_KEVIN_50.pdf?sequence=1)

Oesch, G. R. (2005). *Teaching Excellence: Perceptions of Community College Students* (Doctoral Dissertation), University of South Florida. Retrievable at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1795&context=etd>

O'Hara, S. (2009). Vital and Overlooked: The Role of Faculty in Internationalizing U.S. Campuses. *IIE Study Abroad White Paper Series*, 6, pp. 38 – 45.

Oliveira, P. C. Oliveira, C. G., Neri de Souza, F. and N. Costa (2006). Teaching Strategies to Promote Active Learning in Higher Education. *Current Developments in Technology-Assisted Education*, 636-640.

Open Doors (2010). *International students in the United States (2010)*. Institute of International Education. Available at: <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=113743>

Open Doors (2008). Institute for International Education. Retrieved from <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/>

Papanastasiou, E. (1999). *Teacher evaluation*. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Park, P. (2001). Managing the Scientific Multitudes. *The Scientists*, 15 (19):31.

Peterson, N. B., Friedman, R. H., Ash, A. S., Franco, S. & Carr, P. L. (2004). Faculty Self-reported Experience with Racial and Ethnic Discrimination in Academic Medicine. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 19 (3), 259–265. DOI: 10.1111/j.1525-1497.2004.20409.x

Puri, A, Graves, D., Lowenstein, A. & Hsu, L. (2012). New Faculty's Perception of Faculty Development Initiatives at Small Teaching Institutions. *International Scholarly Research Network*. Doi:10.5402/2012/726270. Retrieved from: <http://www.hindawi.com/isrn/education/2012/726270/>



- Quazi, R., Quddus, M., Debnath, M. and Tandon, S. (2004). Foreign born professoriate in American institutions: A case study. Presented at the International Academy of Business and Public Administration Disciplines (IABPAD), Spring Conference, May 24-26, Gold Strike Casino Resort in Tunica, Mississippi.
- Renaud, R.D. & Murray, H.G. (1996). Aging, personality, and teaching effectiveness in academic psychologists. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 323-340.
- Revell, A., & Wainwright, E. (2009). What makes lectures "unmissable"? Insights into teaching excellence and active learning. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 33, 209-233.
- Rodabaugh, R.C. (1996). Institutional commitment to fairness in college teaching. In L. Fisch (Ed.), *Ethical dimensions of college and university teaching: Understanding and honoring the special relationship between teachers and students*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 66, 37-46. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rusch, E.A. (2004). Gender and race in leadership preparation: A constrained discourse. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 14-46.
- Schaeffer, G., Epting, K., Zinn, T., & Buskist, W. (2003). Student and faculty perceptions of effective teaching: A successful replication. *Teaching of Psychology*, 30, 133-136.
- Seifert, T.A. & Umbach, P.D. (2008). The effects of faculty demographics characteristics and disciplinary context on dimensions of job satisfaction. *Res. High. Educ.*, 49, 357-381.
- Seldin, P. (1999). *Changing practices in evaluating teaching: A practical guide to improved faculty performance and promotion/tenure decisions*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Shao, L. P.; Anderson, L. P. & Newsome, M. (2007). Evaluating teaching effectiveness: where we are and where we should be. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32 (3), 355-371.
- Sheppard, K. (2004). Global citizenship: The human face of international education. *International Education*, 34 (1), 34-40.
- Sherman, T., Armistead, L. P., Fowler, F., Barksdale, M. A., & Reif, G. (1987). The quest for excellence in university teaching. *Journal of Higher Education*, 58 (1), 66-84.
- Smith, P. J. (2000). A message to sapphire and her sisters in academia. *Women in Higher Education*, 9, 31-34.
- Sorason, S., Davidson, S., & Blatt, B. (1982). *The preparation of teachers: An unstudied problem in education*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Spring, J. (2008). Research on globalization and education. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(2), 330-363.
- Stephan, P. E., & Levin, S.G., (2001). Exceptional contributions to US science by the foreign-born and foreign-educated. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 20, 59-79.

- Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 359-372. doi: 10.1177/1028315307303923
- Stromquist, N. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education*, 53, 81-105.
- Swank, P., Taylor, R., Brady, R. & Frieberg, T. (1989). Sensitivity of classroom observation systems: Measuring teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 57 (2), 171-186.
- Theobald, R. (2007). *International early-career faculty in American higher education: The case of the discipline of geography* (Doctoral dissertation), Department of Geography, University of Colorado.
- Thomas, G., & Hollenshead, C. (2001). Resisting from the margins: The coping strategies of black women and other women of color faculty members at a research university. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 70, 166-175.
- Thomas, J. M., & Johnson, B. J. (2004). Perspectives of international faculty members: Their experiences and stories. *Education and Society*, 22(3), 47-64
- Trice, A. (2003). Faculty perceptions of graduate international students: The benefits and challenges. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(4), 379-403.
- Turner, C. S., Myers, S. L., Jr., & Creswell, J. W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *Journal of Higher Education*, 70, 27-59.
- Ty, R. & Alkarzon, A. (2013). Trends and Issues in Higher Education: International Teaching Assistants in Higher Education in the U.S.A. Presented at the Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult and Higher Education, Lindenwood University, St. Charles, MO, September 20-21. Retrieved from: <http://www.lindenwood.edu/r2p/docs/TyAlkarzon.pdf>
- U.S. Census Bureau (2001). Profile of the foreign-born population in the United States: 2000. Current Population Reports, Special Studies. Retrieved from: <http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-206.pdf>
- U.S. Census bureau (2011). U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration. Retrieved from: <http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/acsbr10-06.pdf>
- Vulcano, B.A. (2007). Extending the Generality of the Qualities and Behaviors Constituting Effective Teaching. *Teaching of Psychology*, 34:2, 114-117, DOI: 10.1080/00986280701293198
- Walsh, D. J., & Maffei, M. J. (1994). Never in a class by themselves: An examination of behaviors affecting the student-professor relationship. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 5(2), 23-49.

Wankat, P. C.(2002).*The Effective, efficient professor: Teaching, Scholarship and Service*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Wann, P.D. (2001, January). Faculty and student perceptions of the behaviors of effective college teachers. Poster presented at the National Institute for the Teaching of Psychology, St. Petersburg Beach, FL.

Waters, M., Kemp, E., & Pucci, A. (1988). High and low faculty evaluations: Descriptions by students. *Teaching of Psychology, 15*, 203—204.

Wells, R., Seifert, T., Park, S., Reed, E., & Umbach, P. D. (2007). Job satisfaction of international faculty in U.S. higher education. *Journal of the Professoriate, 2* (1), 5–32.

Wilson, J. H. & Ryan, R. G. (2012). Formative Teaching evaluations: is student input useful? In M. Kite (Ed.), *Effective evaluation of teaching: A guide for faculty and administrators*.  
Retrieval at the Society for the Teaching of Psychology:  
<http://www.teachpsych.org/resources/e-books>.

Wotruba, T.R. & Wright, P.L. (1975). How to develop a teacher-rating instrument: A research approach. *Journal of Higher Education, 46*, 653-663.

Yair, G. (2008). Can we administer the scholarship of teaching? Lessons from outstanding professors in higher education. *Higher Education, 55*, 447-459.

Yankowski, L. D. (1993). Perceptions of teaching excellence in the Hawaii community college system. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53* (11), 3791. (UMI No.9306328)

Young, S. & Shaw, D.G. (1999).Profiles of effective college and university teachers. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70* (6), 670-686.

APPENDIX A:  
IRB APPROVAL FORM

**AUBURN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD for RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS  
RESEARCH PROTOCOL REVIEW FORM**

For Information or help contact **THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE**, 115 Ramsay Hall, Auburn University  
Phone: 334-844-5966 e-mail: hsubjec@auburn.edu Web Address: <http://www.auburn.edu/research/vpr/ohs/>

Revised 03.26.11 – **DO NOT STAPLE, CLIP TOGETHER ONLY.**

Save a Copy

**1. PROPOSED START DATE of STUDY:**

PROPOSED REVIEW CATEGORY (Check one):       FULL BOARD       EXPEDITED       EXEMPT

**2. PROJECT TITLE:** International and US-educated faculty members' views on what constitutes excellence in teaching

3. Emad A. Mansour      Graduate Student      Educational FLT      844-8530      eam0028@tigermail.auburn.edu  
**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR      TITLE      DEPT      PHONE      AU E-MAIL**

136 Foy Hall CAMPUS      844-0130      FAX      ALTERNATE E-MAIL  
**MAILING ADDRESS**

**4. SOURCE OF FUNDING SUPPORT:**  Not Applicable     Internal     External Agency: \_\_\_\_\_     Pending     Received

**5. LIST ANY CONTRACTORS, SUB-CONTRACTORS, OTHER ENTITIES OR IRBs ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT:**

None

**6. GENERAL RESEARCH PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS**

6A. Mandatory CITI Training	6B. Research Methodology								
<p><b>Names of key personnel who have completed CITI:</b> Emad Mansour</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <p align="center"><b>CITI group completed for this study:</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Social/Behavioral    <input type="checkbox"/> Biomedical</p> <p align="center"><b>PLEASE ATTACH TO HARD COPY ALL CITI CERTIFICATES FOR EACH KEY PERSONNEL</b></p>	<p><b>Please check all descriptors that best apply to the research methodology</b></p> <p>Data Source(s):    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Data      <input type="checkbox"/> Existing Data</p> <p>Will recorded data directly or indirectly identify participants?             Yes      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Data collection will involve the use of:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Educational Tests (cognitive diagnostic, aptitude, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interview / Observation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Physical / Physiological Measures or Specimens (see Section 6D)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Surveys / Questionnaires</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Internet / Electronic</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Audio / Video / Photos</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Private records or files</p>								
6C. Participant Information	6D. Risks to Participants								
<p><b>Please check all descriptors that apply to the participant population.</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Males    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Females      <input type="checkbox"/> AU students</p> <p><b>Vulnerable Populations</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Pregnant Women/Fetuses    <input type="checkbox"/> Prisoners</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Children and/or Adolescents (under age 19 in AL)</p> <p><b>Persons with:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Economic Disadvantages    <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Disabilities</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Educational Disadvantages    <input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual Disabilities</p> <p><b>Do you plan to compensate your participants?</b>    <input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><b>Please identify all risks that participants might encounter in this research.</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Breach of Confidentiality*</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Coercion</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Deception</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Physical</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Psychological</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Social</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other:</td> </tr> </table> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p><small>*Note that if the investigator is using or accessing confidential or identifiable data, breach of confidentiality is always a risk.</small></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Breach of Confidentiality*	<input type="checkbox"/> Coercion	<input type="checkbox"/> Deception	<input type="checkbox"/> Physical	<input type="checkbox"/> Psychological	<input type="checkbox"/> Social	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="checkbox"/> Breach of Confidentiality*	<input type="checkbox"/> Coercion								
<input type="checkbox"/> Deception	<input type="checkbox"/> Physical								
<input type="checkbox"/> Psychological	<input type="checkbox"/> Social								
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:								
<p><b>Do you need IBC Approval for this study?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No    <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - BUA # _____    Expiration date _____</p>									

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from 10/27/13 to 10/26/16  
 Protocol # 13-362 EX 1310

Received  
 OCT 18 2013  
 Research Compliance

**FOR OHSR OFFICE USE ONLY**

DATE RECEIVED IN OHSR: 10-18-13 by CB      PROTOCOL # 13-362 EX 1310

DATE OF IRB REVIEW: 10/27/13 by CC      APPROVAL CATEGORY: 45 CFR 46.101(2)

DATE OF IRB APPROVAL: \_\_\_\_\_ by \_\_\_\_\_      INTERVAL FOR CONTINUING REVIEW: 3 years

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX B:  
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION LETTER

## Appendix B

### Invitation to participate in a brief study

You are invited to participate in a research study entitled “**International and US-educated faculty members’ views on what constitutes excellence in teaching.**” Faculty at universities in the Southeastern United States have been selected to participate. The results of this survey can be useful for universities in designing enrichment programs for faculty members.

This study is being conducted by **Emad Mansour**, doctoral student, in the Auburn University Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology under the direction of **Dr. James Groccia**, professor of Higher Education at Auburn University. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a faculty member at a university in the Southeastern US.

The survey contains a few demographic questions and asks you to evaluate 28 qualities of excellent teaching from your perspective. Your total time commitment will be approximately 5-7 minutes.

There are no risks or discomfort associated with participating in this survey. Participation is completely voluntary and no compensation will be offered.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time by closing your browser window. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University or the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology.

Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous. You will not be asked to provide any identifying information (i.e., your name). Information collected through your participation may be published in professional journals and/or presented at professional meetings.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Emad Mansour by phone at (334) 8448530 or email at [eam0028@auburn.edu](mailto:eam0028@auburn.edu).


If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Human Subjects Research or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334)8445966 or email at [hsubjec@auburn.edu](mailto:hsubjec@auburn.edu) or [IRBChair@auburn.edu](mailto:IRBChair@auburn.edu).

Having read this information, clicking on the URL below indicates your permission to participate. Thank you

[https://auburn.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV\\_e3tXBEb8e15RXyF](https://auburn.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_e3tXBEb8e15RXyF)

Please add this approval information in sentence form to this letter. Send the updated letter, with a live link, to the IRB.



  
Investigator's Signature

10-17-13  
Date:

Emad Mansour  
Investigator's Name

Ph.D. Candidate  
Educational Foundations, Leadership, & Technology  
College of Education  
Auburn University  
Auburn, AL36849

Mailing address:  
Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning  
136 Foy Hall  
Auburn University,  
Auburn, AL36849





APPENDIX C:  
TEACHER BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST ONLINE SURVEY

## The Teacher Behavior Checklist (TBC) Survey

Please kindly respond to the following questions:

### Gender

- Male
- Female

### Country of Birth

### Country where you completed your undergraduate education

### Country where you completed your first graduate degree (e.g. MSc., MA)

### Country where you completed you highest graduate degree

Have you participated in any graduate student professional development programs that prepared you for college/university teaching?

- Yes
- No

### Rank

- Full professor
- Associate professor

- Assistant professor
- Other

**Years of experience in teaching**

**Discipline**

Page 1 of 2

**Instructions:**

Below are 28 teacher’s qualities and behaviors that reflect each quality.

Please click on, hold and drag to the top of the list **ONLY ten (10) qualities/ behaviors** that you think are most important to highly effective teaching” at the college level, **where item ranked "1" will be the most important**, item ranked "2" will be second most important and so on.

***Please do not select fewer than 10 qualities/behaviors.***

- **Accessible** (*Posts office hours, gives out phone number, and e-mail information*)
- **Approachable/Personable** (*Smiles, greets students, initiates conversations, invites questions, responds respectfully to student comments*)
- **Authoritative** (*Establishes clear course rules; maintains classroom order; speaks in a loud, strong voice*)
- **Confident** (*Speaks clearly, makes eye contact, and answers questions correctly*)
- **Creative and interesting** (*Experiments with teaching methods; uses technological devices to support and enhance lectures; uses interesting, relevant, and personal examples; not monotone*)
- **Effective Communicator** (*Speaks clearly/loudly; uses precise English; gives clear, compelling examples*)
- **Encourages and Cares for Students** (*Provides praise for good student work, helps students who need it, offers bonus points and extra credit, and knows student names*)
- **Enthusiastic about Teaching and about Topic** (*Smiles during class, prepares interesting class activities, uses gestures and expressions of emotion to emphasize important points, and arrives on time for class*)
- **Establishes Daily and Academic Term Goals** (*Prepares/follows the syllabus and has goals for each class*)
- **Flexible/Open-Minded** (*Changes calendar of course events when necessary, will meet at hours outside of office hours, pays attention to students when they state their opinions, accepts criticism from others, and allows students to do make-up work when appropriate*)

- **Good listener** (Doesn't interrupt students while they are talking, maintains eye contact, and asks questions about points that students are making)
- **Happy/Positive Attitude/Humorous** (*Tells jokes and funny stories, laughs with students*)
- **Humble** (*Admits mistakes, never brags, and doesn't take credit for others' successes*)
- **Knowledgeable About Subject Matter** (*Easily answers students' questions, does not read straight from the book or notes, and uses clear and understandable examples*)
- **Prepared** (*Brings necessary materials to class, is never late for class, provides outlines of class discussion*)
- **Presents Current Information** (*Relates topic to current, real-life situations; uses recent videos, magazines, and newspapers to demonstrate points; talks about current topics; uses new or recent texts*)
- **Professional** (*Dresses nicely [neat and clean shoes, slacks, blouses, dresses, shirts, ties] and no profanity*)
- **Promotes Class Discussion** (*Asks controversial or challenging questions during class, gives points for class participation, involves students in group activities during class*)
- **Promotes Critical Thinking/Intellectually Stimulating** (*Asks thoughtful questions during class, uses essay questions on tests and quizzes, assigns homework, and holds group discussions/activities*)
- **Provides Constructive Feedback** (*Writes comments on returned work, answers students' questions, and gives advice on test-taking*)
- **Punctuality/Manages Class Time** (*Arrives to class on time/early, dismisses class on time, presents relevant materials in class, leaves time for questions, keeps appointments, returns work in a timely way*)
- **Rapport** (*Makes class laugh through jokes and funny stories, initiates and maintains class discussions, knows student names, interacts with students before and after class*)
- **Realistic Expectations of Students/Fair Testing and Grading** (*Covers material to be tested during class, writes relevant test questions, does not overload students with reading, teaches at an appropriate level for the majority of students in the course, curves grades when appropriate*)
- **Respectful** (*Does not humiliate or embarrass students in class, is polite to students [says thank you and please, etc.], does not interrupt students while they are talking, does not talk down to students*)
- **Sensitive and Persistent** (*Makes sure students understand material before moving to new material, holds extra study sessions, repeats information when necessary, asks questions to check student understanding*)
- **Strives to Be a Better Teacher** (*Requests feedback on his/her teaching ability from students, continues learning [attends workshops, etc. on teaching], and uses new teaching methods*)
- **Technologically Competent** (*Knows how to use a computer, knows how to use e-mail with students, knows how to use overheads during class, has a Web page for classes*)
- **Understanding** (*Accepts legitimate excuses for missing class or coursework, is available before/after class to answer questions, does not lose temper at students, takes extra time to discuss difficult concepts*)

**Page 2 of 2**  
**Please hit "Next" to Submit**