

# The impacts of the United States International Training Program in Pedagogy in Higher Education on visiting scholars in China

---

**Yuliang Liu**

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Illinois, US: [yliu@siue.edu](mailto:yliu@siue.edu)

**Mary Weishaar**

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Illinois, US: [mweisha@siue.edu](mailto:mweisha@siue.edu)

**Huaibo Xin**

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Illinois, US: [hxin@siue.edu](mailto:hxin@siue.edu)

**Gretchen Fricke**

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Illinois, US: [gfricke@siue.edu](mailto:gfricke@siue.edu)

**Tom Lavallee**

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Illinois, US: [tlavale@siue.edu](mailto:tlavale@siue.edu)

*The longitudinal study was designed to investigate the impacts of the International Training Program in Pedagogy (ITPP) at a midwestern institution in the US on the visiting scholars in seven cohorts from China in 2012–18. The study used the cohort survey research design method. The first part of the data was collected from 48 visiting scholars from Northwest Normal University in China who participated in the seven ITPP cohorts. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected through several surveys from the beginning to the end of the training in each cohort from August to December each year in 2012-2018. In addition, a recent online impact survey was used to collect up-to-date data from the scholars in September 2020. The results of the quantitative and qualitative surveys revealed similar findings. It was found that the ITPP had significantly influenced all scholars. They had learned the American college teaching pedagogy in the US and exhibited different attitudes towards instruction and related practices in China. International implications result from the study.*

*Keywords: international training program in pedagogy; visiting scholars; China; cohort survey research design; quantitative and qualitative*

## INTRODUCTION

### Project background

“Internationalization is changing the world of higher education” (Knight, 2004, p. 5). Hosting international scholars can be mutually beneficial to the host faculty and institution and to the visiting scholar and home institution. From 2019–2020, US

*The impacts of the United States International Training Program in Pedagogy in Higher Education on visiting scholars in China*

institutions hosted over 123,000 visiting scholars, with the majority coming from China (Martel et al., 2020). International scholars help to create linkages between US institutions and international home institutions, providing global research networking and establishing teaching partnerships (Martel et al., 2020) and helping to create mutual understanding and knowledge sharing between nations (Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. n.d.). The International Training Program in Pedagogy (ITPP) contributed to international scholar exchange at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville (SIUE).

The lead author's background and professional interest has led to a strong interest and high participation in US pedagogy training in higher education. Such high participation warrants investigation into the long-term impact of the international experiences and inform how US programs can further structure experiences to maximize benefits to visitors and universities such as SIUE. In China, because of various issues, such as the large class sizes, lecturing is still a dominant instructional method in undergraduate and graduate education (Liang & Li, 2018). However, most Chinese universities embrace internationalization; this is especially the case in the recent decade (Zha et al., 2019). To meet such demand, and after several years of preparation, SIUE proposed the ITTP in the fall of 2012. It is different from other international faculty partnership programs and fits into SIUE's international focus. The ITTP addresses the issues of pedagogies in ways that aim to enable Chinese faculty to apply American college teaching pedagogy to their teaching in China. Housed in the School of Education, Health, and Human Behavior, the ITTP program has the potential to significantly impact Chinese faculty teaching practices, students, programs/departments, and – in the long run – the university itself.

Pedagogy can be described as how a professor teaches or the way a professor delivers the content of the curriculum to a class. Pedagogy involves applying effective educational strategies based on appropriate teaching theories, assessment and feedback. In this study, the US pedagogy was framed around the SIUE's (n. d.) *Ethics of Instruction*, which is the minimum expectations required of faculty when they teach students, and the *SIUE Teacher Scholar Philosophy* (SIUE, 2008). The *Ethics of Instruction* were formulated in SIUE policy in 1981, updated in 1994, 1996 and 2014 and include, for example, use of a syllabus, providing a grading policy to students, schedule of office hours, returning graded student work with helpful explanations, assisting with support for instruction and providing an environment free of favouritism, prejudice, discrimination or harassment. These minimum expectations provide the framework for student evaluation of faculty each semester in each course. Faculty then use student evaluations to document faculty improvement in the same class over time, help to determine the quality of faculty teaching and assess the extent to which faculty use evaluation results to improve their teaching. The *SIUE Teacher Scholar Philosophy* was developed in 2008 to describe the importance of how scholarship enriches teaching and service. The *SIUE Teacher Scholar Philosophy*, based on the work of Ernest Boyer (1990), encourages faculty members to master and use current knowledge of their discipline in teaching, use appropriate theories on student learning and pedagogy, and assess their teaching effectiveness using assessments to inform teaching. The philosophy: understands current developments in the discipline, advances student understanding of the discipline, evaluates and analyzes their teaching practices, has

knowledge of discipline-specific pedagogical strategies, applies effective strategies to facilitate learning of a diverse student population, applies knowledge to the development of courses and the curriculum, and uses evidence-based assessment of teaching to improve teaching strategies (SIUE, 2008). Researchers, such as Cuenca (2010) and Murphy (2003) support different aspects of this philosophy.

To learn about the American college teaching pedagogy within a US cultural context, visiting scholars observed classes, participated in a seminar that included reflection and discussion of the ethics of instruction and diversity issues in higher education. They participated in tours of cultural and local K-16 sites, as well as had structured and informal interactions with faculty and students at SIUE.

Hall (2007) asserted that higher education should put the same effort into developing faculty exchanges, as it does for arranging study abroad experiences for students. To date, no research has been carried out on the efficacy of programs similar to SIUE's ITPP. In 2012, SIUE developed a partnership with Northwest Normal University (NWNNU) in Gansu Province, China. This partnership was designed to benefit both institutions' faculties, as well as provide faculties and students at SIUE and NWNNU visiting scholars with opportunities to learn about instructional and cultural differences. The ITPP program was adapted in part from the principal components of best practices as described in the *International leaders in education program request for host university proposals* (International Research and Exchanges Board, n.d.). Since fall 2021, the ITPP's program expenses (e.g., course buy-out and graduate assistantship) has been primarily funded by NWNNU. The lead author was a key member of the program's Leadership Team (see further information at <http://www.siu.edu/education/internationaltraining/index.shtml>). The ITPP Leadership Team (the authors of this article) collaborated across schools and colleges (e.g., Schools of Business and Engineering, College of Arts and Sciences, School of Education, Health, and Human Behavior) to implement the program to meet scholars' disciplinary needs.

Typically, visiting scholars participating in the ITPP observed three courses in their disciplines at SIUE during the semester. Upon returning to their home institution, the scholars were expected to adapt their instructions to their own classes and thus influence their own students' learning, skills, and attitudes in China. In addition, the Chinese faculty's visits at SIUE provided opportunities for American faculty and students to learn about the Chinese culture and educational practices.

Since fall 2012, the ITPP has successfully achieved its goals, having significant positive impacts on visiting scholars' perception of the American college teaching pedagogy (Xin et al., 2015). Notably, the scholars' presentation skills and English proficiency level improved significantly. About 43% of the SIUE host faculty members indicated that their students benefited from having a Chinese faculty member in their classes. More than 95% claimed that their experience with the Chinese faculty members was generally positive; and about 78% would like to participate in future partnerships with Chinese faculty members. Fifty-five percent of 29 SIUE non-host faculty and staff members stated that they understood how to interact with faculty from China; 31% would like to seek possible avenues of international collaboration with faculty from China; 69% stated that their interactions with Chinese faculty members during the semester were mostly positive; and 62% were interested in hosting or participating in future international initiatives. Some of the above findings are consistent with other

*The impacts of the United States International Training Program in Pedagogy in  
Higher Education on visiting scholars in China*

findings of the positive effects of international exchange programs (Clinebell & Kvedaraviciene, 2013).

### **Research problem**

The purpose of this study was to investigate what impacts the ITPP had on the visiting scholars' learning of American college teaching pedagogy and on their teaching upon returning to their home institutions in China.

### **Literature review**

#### ***Government policies***

According to a recent document from the US Department of Education, *Succeeding Globally through international education and engagement: US Department of Education International Strategy 2012-16* (2012), the US needs to fulfill one of its two strategic goals of advancing the US's international priorities by "international benchmarking and applying lessons learned from other countries and education diplomacy and engagement with other countries" (p. 1). Those priorities include but are not limited to: expanding higher education global partnerships, increasing international educational exchange, and promoting equity in education. Globalization has different functions. First, it creates and enhances diversity. Diversity helps students develop/acquire knowledge and skills to participate and lead in a diverse environment and increase their compatibility of differences, including racial and cultural engagement (Gurin, 2002). The US Department of Education's policy is consistent with the idea of education becoming the "focal point of intercultural understanding, of peaceful coexistence, of democracy, and of global citizenship" (Gacel-Ávila, 2005, p. 133). Second, globalization can facilitate an internationally agreed-upon terminology of democracy, which is heavily influenced by different cultures and histories (Rowland, 2003).

#### ***Faculty partnerships***

International faculty partnerships are not new in higher education. Many US institutions have worked on those partnerships in various areas with institutions in many other countries, including China. Specifically, many higher education institutions engage in international partnerships aimed at benefiting their faculty and students (Ailinger et al., 2001; Altbach & Knight, 2007; Cate et al., 2014; Fung & Filippo, 2002). These partnerships involve different formats, such as: developing online learning opportunities; sending faculty abroad to research and/or teach at a foreign institution; participating in traditional student exchange programs; allowing classmates to travel abroad as a group and learn class-related material at a foreign university; providing higher education in a foreign location (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Amey, 2010); adding an international component to the engineering curriculum to foster greater international communications and global awareness (Torres, 2002), and; accessing and sharing digital library resources between Chinese universities and American universities (Miller, 2000). Some colleges participate in partnerships for profits, and some colleges use partnerships to improve the research and learning opportunities of faculty and students while also increasing cultural understanding (Altbach & Knight, 2007). One of

the US sponsored flagship programs, the Fulbright Scholar Program, has been successfully engaging in “cultural diplomacy” for over 65 years (Fulbright Scholar Program, n.d.). According to Ault and Martell (2007), international programs promote diversity on college campuses.

A few years ago, the Johns Hopkins and Peking Union Medical College (PUMC) (Leng et al., 2010) established a useful international model for geriatrics program development in China to train the trainers including internists (6 months), nurses (3 months), and physicians (3 months) for PUMC. According to Leng et al., the project achieved significant impacts on the trainers involved. In addition, Cate et al. (2014) started five schools across the globe and, in 2016, decided to enhance international faculty experiences through an exciting new collaboration called the International Medical Educators Exchange (IMEX) initiative. Cate et al. found that about 55% of IMEX alumni felt that their IMEX experiences impacted their professional competence and international perspectives and, to some degree, their professional career, their daily job and their home institution.

Chen et al. (2014) conducted a program to teach a small group of Chinese physiatrists and physiotherapists to become trainers and leaders in hemophilia physiotherapy (PT) care in China. They found that the “Train-the-Trainer” model and practice effectively accelerates training in hemophilia PT in China. Banh and Cave (2016) conducted a program to provide adequate personalized one-on-one training to four pharmacists to provide pharmaceutical care to patients, conduct clinical pharmacy-related research, and engage in scholarly activities. They found that the key to successful implementation of the program is to be flexible and adapt their training to the local Chinese context. Camacci et al. (2019) studied 114 US ophthalmology residency programs and found that more than half of the respondents felt that the residents benefited more than the hosts during these international experiences.

Research consistently indicates that Chinese students and professors can help make the US a more globally competitive country (Li, 2010). Individual interactions with foreign faculty members can create opportunities for professional growth and opportunities to learn new skills (Center for the Development of Public Health Practice [CDPHP], 1993; Fung & Filippo, 2002). Whether Chinese students and faculty remain in the US or return home, their presence at US universities can create future opportunities for collaboration between the two countries (CDPHP, 1993; Li, 2010). Universities focusing on partnerships with foreign universities can improve their reputation of the universities (Jie, 2010). Students and professors returning to China after gaining experience at a foreign institution make them and China more competitive (Li, 2010). According to Xiaoxuan (2004), those returning to China will potentially be leaders in research and education once they apply what they learned in the US (see also, Li, 2010).

Related recent research has consistently reported the positive impacts of the visiting scholars involved in the international programs, such as the Fulbright Program sponsored by the US Department of State (Alaraje & Elaraj, 2018; Biraimah & Jotia, 2013; Eddy, 2014; Farris et al., 2010; Phelps, 2005; Turner, 2019). Phelps (2005) stated: “A Fulbright is an experience of the mind. It causes one to rethink oneself and one’s country while puzzling out another” (p. C1). In addition, Biraimah and Jotia (2013) reported that Fulbright Hays’ “perspectives on their own personal and professional development, cultural awareness, teaching methodologies, and choice of curricular content indicated sustained positive growth throughout the program” (p. 433).

Many other researchers have confirmed similar positive impacts. Turner (2019) reported how she and her home institution have benefited from her Fulbright experiences visiting libraries in India.

Due to the college pedagogy training nature of the international faculty exchange being specifically focused on different methods of teaching instruction as described previously at SIUE, there were no directly related studies to follow in the literature. Dewey and Duff (2009) stated that “surprisingly little work has been published that addresses the roles, responsibilities and problems faced by the faculty on an operational level” (p. 491). Cooper and Mitsunaga (2010) noted that “The experiences of faculty who participate in cross-institutional, cross-national collaborations, the motivations behind their willingness to engage in this work, and the forces that support or hinder their work are relatively unknown” (p. 70). However, a comprehensive examination of the recent related literature indicates that most related research focuses on scholars’ research impacts in China (e.g., Hu et al., 2020; Wu, 2015). Li (2020) analysed the distribution characteristics and manifestations of internationalization from faculty returnee to Chinese colleges as well as their impacts on the internationalization of higher education in the three dimensions of scientific research output, teaching content and methods, and international exchanges. In terms of teaching, faculty returnee members adjust teaching and focus on international perspectives and content in their course teaching content and methods.

Although there were not any studies on American college teaching pedagogy training in international faculty exchange for the Chinese scholars in the US, there are other types of faculty exchange and pre-service teaching programs which can have implications for this study. Otieno and Otieno (2016) reported how an American college had a faculty exchange partnership with a college in Kenya. That program included four activities: class observation in both colleges, international dialogue series, cultural enrichment, and research. That program involved only a limited number of faculty, with English being the common language. This present study, however, is different in several major aspects. First, this study involves more faculty in each cohort. Second, scholars’ native language is Chinese and their oral and listening English is limited at the beginning of the visits, meaning they could not teach in English at SIUE.

### **Theoretical framework of the study**

The ITPP design and the research was guided by three major theoretical design foundations. First, the ITPP was based on Bandura’s (1986) social learning theory, which provided the framework for ITPP to be an effective means of preparing faculty in Chinese universities to work in an international environment. Social learning theory, also called observational learning, describes the learning process that takes place when an observer’s behaviour or attitude changes after viewing the behaviour of another. According to Bandura, this process is involved in modelling. Necessary conditions for effective modelling include: attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation. That is, in order to make modelling effective, learners should be attentive to the activities, retain information learned, act out what information was learned, and be motivated to learn and perform. This modelling process can influence the generation of new behaviour patterns and attitudes and enhance creativity. The observation of a diverse variety of models fosters creativity and promotes self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Chinese scholars

participating in ITPP were heavily engaged in intensive observations of American teaching at SIUE.

Second, the ITPP was designed based on the train-the-trainer (TTT) model. Some researchers, such as Ross-Gordon (2001), have found that trainers who prepare themselves for the training/mentoring role by participating in TTT type workshops increase their potential to enhance the professional growth and development as instructors, as well as increase learning outcomes for students. The ITPP is consistent with the principles of andragogy (how adults learn), as articulated by Knowles (1980). Knowles focused on a few aspects, such as reservoir of experience, immediacy of application, internally motivation, and self-direction. The TTT model has been implemented in many areas, such as in health care and education (e.g., Marks et al., 2013), but not much in international faculty training in higher education. In the ITPP, visiting scholars came to SIUE to observe three courses each semester, attend weekly seminars and/or workshops about American college teaching pedagogy, participate in local culture and school visits, make three presentations publicly to the SIUE campus, etc. The visiting scholars were expected to be leaders in teaching innovatively in universities in China.

Third, the ITPP was designed based on a popular instructional system design model, called ADDIE model: Analyse, Design, Develop, Implement, and Evaluate. According to Dick et al. (2004), this model has evolved several times over the years to become iterative, dynamic, and user friendly. The following list describes how the ITPP program included major steps of the ADDIE model:

1. “Analyse” includes analyses of the scholars’ features, the program content, and goals/objectives. Specifically, this covers the who, what, when, where, why, how of the program? The team identified the scholars’ interest, expertise, and needs, analysed the content to be covered, identified how the program goals/objectives could be achieved at the end, and planned for various program logistics.
2. “Design” refers to designing related activities to help achieve program goals/objectives. Specifically, this covers a strategy, structure, delivery methods, duration, assessment, storyboards/prototypes, and feedback of the program. The team identified specific activities for the scholars. They included attending the international orientation before the semester started, as well as observing classes in their expertise, attending pedagogical seminar, conducting ongoing presentations, as well as participating in cultural and community activities every week in the semester.
3. “Develop” refers to collecting and solidifying all related information and resources for implementation. Specifically, this covers creating program content. The team identified and detailed the international orientation activities, specific courses for observation for each scholar, topics for pedagogical seminar, and a list of cultural and community activities.
4. “Implement” refers to carrying out all proposed activities. Specifically, this covers delivery, tracking, and reporting of the program. The team members managed the different aspects of the program such as assisting course observation, teaching pedagogical seminar, leading cultural and community activities, and having program meetings every week.

5. “Evaluate” refers to assessing program impacts using a variety of related data sources in the semester and at the end of the program. Specifically, this covers collecting ongoing feedback from participants for the assessment/evaluation report and actionable changes for current or future programs. The team not only met every week to monitor the program progress but also collected ongoing feedback at different points, such as scholars’ pretest before the program, ongoing presentations in the semester, and post-test at the end.

### **Research question and hypothesis**

Utilizing the above literature, the major research question was: What were the impacts of ITPP on the visiting scholars’ teaching after completing the program? Thus, it was hypothesized that visiting scholars who attended the ITPP (a) had learned the American college teaching pedagogy and (b) exhibited different attitudes toward instruction and related practices in China compared with before their attending the ITPP in the US.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The three theoretical models discussed above provided a basis for the research design as they all involved learning new ways of instruction. This was important to the study as the participants were immersed in an intensive learning environment, including weekly class observations during the ITPP program. This intensive learning environment provided rich instructions to enable the participants to learn new forms of pedagogy or teaching that would enrich their practice of teaching in their home country.

#### **Participants**

Participants included 48 visiting scholars from NWNNU in China who participated in ITPP in the fall semester during 2012-2018. The number of scholars in each cohort and sex-disaggregated information are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Summary of ITPP participant information (2012-2018)**

<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>Total</b>
4 (2M+2F)	8 (2M+6F)	8 (3M+5F)	8 (3M+5F)	9 (2M+7F)	5 (5F)	5 (2M+3F)	48 (14M+34F)

**Note: M refers to males; F refers to females.**

Participants had different academic backgrounds, including education, business, engineering, arts, and sciences. They were mostly in their 30s and early 40s and held various academic ranks, such as lecturers, associate professors, and professors. They were screened and selected by NWNNU to apply for participation in the ITPP in the spring semester. Their applications typically included a self-recorded video interview answering the ITPP’s several key questions, curriculum vitae, and visiting objectives. The ITPP Leadership Team reviewed the applications and made the final decision to accept or decline the application.



Visiting scholars arrived one week before the fall semester started and participated in the international student orientation week in the middle of August. They lived in the family housing on campus. They all engaged in the following activities: observed teaching in three classes related to the scholars' areas of expertise and educational foundations at the undergraduate and/graduate levels per week, participated in weekly seminars focusing on American college teaching pedagogy, made three presentations in the beginning, middle and the end of the semester (open to the campus community), engaged in community outreach (e.g., senior dialogue, guest speaking, visiting public schools), and participated in local cultural activities throughout the community.

### **Instruments**

Two main instruments were designed and used for impact data collection related to ITPP in 2012-2018:

1. Pre-test and post-test surveys. This was designed to assess the Chinese faculty's attitudes towards American college teaching pedagogy in the US. It had eight items on a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 the lowest and 7 the highest in addition to open comments, as well as opportunity for comments. Both surveys were completed via the SIUE's online Qualtrics before the scholars' arrivals in the US in August and at the end of the program in December before return to China. The possible minimum (8) and maximum (56) scores responses to the survey indicated how well scholars perceived American universities function and what it is like to teach at American universities. The higher score the more likely the scholar knew about American college teaching pedagogy. Scores and comments were used to compare changes over a semester. See Appendix 1 for the survey details.
2. Presentation Survey. This was designed to assess scholars' progress in presentations in English and was evaluated via hard copies by the ITPP Leadership Team three times, typically in late September, later October, and early December for each cohort. The survey had 12 items in three categories: content, delivery, and English fluency, in addition to one open ended question at the end. The major quantitative items included: organization, clarity, creativity, coherence, general understanding, audience contact, articulation/pronunciation, visual aids, English spelling, and English fluency. The survey was on a 10-point Likert scale, with 1 unacceptable and 10 most competent. The possible minimum and maximum total scores for each scholar were from 12 to 120. The higher the score the better the scholar could conduct presentations in English. Scores and comments were used to compare changes in three presentations over a semester. See Appendix 2 for the survey details.

An "overall impact survey" was also conducted. The lead author has recently designed and implemented this online survey, which was completed by scholars in September 2020, to collect more important impact data. The survey included four quantitative items on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 the lowest and 5 the highest, in addition to open comments. The four quantitative items included (a) useful to teaching, (b) useful to students, (c) useful to program/discipline/department/school, and (d) useful to university. The possible minimum and maximum total scores for this survey for each scholar were from 4 to 20. The higher the scores indicated the more the ITPP had

affected the scholars' teaching in China. Scores and comments were used to show the impacts of ITPP on scholars' teaching in China. See Appendix 3 for the survey details.

### **Research design**

This longitudinal study used the cohort survey research design (Gay et al., 2012) to collect and analyse data and to assess the project impacts over seven years from 2012 to 2018. Each fall of those seven years, each cohort involved different scholars, but they received the same ITPP program training. Specifically, prior quantitative and qualitative data were collected from the beginning to the end of the program for each cohort using the instruments discussed above in 2012-2018. In addition, as also noted, a new online survey collected data in September 2020.

In order to investigate the research problem, the team identified and stated the research problem, constructed a series of instruments for data collection, revised the instruments several times based on discussion and feedback, administered and distributed instruments to scholars before and after the program, as well as to scholars, host faculty, and the community participants during the program.

### **Procedure**

Before being initiated by the ITPP Leadership Team in the fall of 2012, the program was approved by the School and University administrations at SIUE. During the program, the School and University administrations supported the program in many ways; since NWNU in China financially sponsored the ITPP in 2012-2018, some team members received course release time to manage and implement the program. Typically, the program's preparations started in spring and continued into summer. The team received scholars' applications electronically, reviewed the applications, and made decisions to accept or decline them, then coordinated with the International Affairs Office about how to assist scholars to get visas. The program then began in the fall. Due to the focus of the study, some program details not closely related to this article are not included here.

### **Data analysis**

Both quantitative and qualitative data from the seven years were compiled and examined. This process included, but was not limited to organization, coding, screening, accuracy checking, cleanup, process, and analysis of survey data and the overall impact survey data of September 2020. There was no missing data from the 48 pretest and posttest surveys. However, while data from the first and third presentations were complete, data from the second presentation was not complete, so data from the second presentation was not included for this analysis, but this omission did not affect the study. For all 48 scholars, the mean of each survey item was calculated. Statistical analysis was carried out using the SPSS 26 program. Thirty scholars (62.5%) completed the online overall impact survey of September 2020.

The qualitative data was examined using a phenomenological research approach, which "describes the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or a phenomenon. Phenomenologists focus on describing what all participants have in

common as they experience a phenomenon” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 75). To do so, the study categorized participant qualitative responses into themes using Atlas Ti to interrogate the data, following the steps specified by Krippendorff (1980). Specifically, content analysis involves a set of procedures in the following five steps: 1) The researcher formulates a research question and/or hypotheses, 2) The researcher selects a sample, 3) Categories are defined for coding, 4) Coders are trained, code the content, and the reliability of their coding is checked, 5) The data collected during the coding process are analysed and interpreted.

## RESULTS

Overall, the qualitative and quantitative data sources revealed similar findings. That is, the research hypotheses in the study were supported. The results of the scholars’ pre-post surveys in all the seven cohorts of 2012-18 are reported in Tables 2 and 3. Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the scholars’ pre-post surveys. Table 3 shows the results of the paired samples *t* test for the scholars’ pre-post surveys.

**Table 2: Descriptive statistics for the scholars’ pre-post surveys (N=48)**

		Mean	SD
Pair 1	Pre syllabus development	3.70	1.627
	Post syllabus development	5.94	1.480
Pair 2	Pre understand American pedagogy	3.36	1.566
	Post understand American pedagogy	5.83	1.167
Pair 3	Pre know teach in US	2.87	1.424
	Post know teach in US	5.47	1.139
Pair 4	Pre know American library	2.77	1.507
	Post know American library	5.87	1.135
Pair 5	Pre understand teacher scholar in US	3.36	1.621
	Post understand teacher scholar in US	5.60	1.245
Pair 6	Pre understand culture in US	3.36	1.258
	Post understand culture in US	5.47	1.120
Pair 7	Pre understand teaching ethics in US	3.15	1.503
	Post understand teaching ethics in US	5.60	1.155
Pair 8	Pre know interact with faculty in US	3.36	1.481
	Post know interact with faculty in US	5.53	1.316

**Table 3: Results of paired samples *t* test for the scholars’ pre-post surveys (N=48)**

		N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pre syllabus development - Post syllabus development	48	-2.234	2.379	-6.437	47	.000***
Pair 2	Pre understand American pedagogy - post understand American pedagogy	48	-2.468	1.792	-9.443	47	.000***

*The impacts of the United States International Training Program in Pedagogy in Higher Education on visiting scholars in China*

Pair 3	Pre know teach in US - Post know teach in US	48	-2.596	1.597	-11.143	47	.000***
Pair 4	Pre know American library - Post know American library	48	-3.106	1.710	-12.456	47	.000***
Pair 5	Pre understand teacher scholar in US - Post understand teacher scholar in US	48	-2.234	1.772	-8.644	47	.000***
Pair 6	Pre understand culture in US - Post understand culture in US	48	-2.106	1.645	-8.779	47	.000***
Pair 7	Pre understand teaching ethics in US - Post understand teaching ethics in US	48	-2.447	1.827	-9.179	47	.000***
Pair 8	Pre know interact with faculty in US - Post know interact with faculty in US	48	-2.170	1.798	-8.277	47	.000***

Note: \*\*\*  $p < .001$

As Tables 2 and 3 indicate, we can be almost 100% confident that the ITPP program had significantly affected scholars in all eight areas between the pretest and posttest,  $p = .000$ . The eight areas are: (a) developing a course syllabus in English, (b) understanding American college teaching pedagogy, (c) knowing how to teach in American colleges, (d) knowing how to use American library resources, (e) understanding what it means to become a Teacher Scholar in colleges in the US, (f) understanding culture and life in the US, (g) understanding the ethics of college teaching in the US, (h) knowing how to interact with faculty from the US.

The results of the scholars' two presentation assessments in all seven cohorts during 2012-18 are reported in Tables 4 and 5. Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics for the scholars' presentation assessments at the beginning and the end of the program. Table 5 shows the results of the paired samples  $t$  test for the scholars' two presentation assessments between the first presentation and the last presentation. As noted previously, each year's first and last presentation scores for each item was first averaged and then the means of all seven years for each item were again averaged for analysis. So, the sample size was 7 years in this analysis. The purpose was to compare the mean differences in each of the ten items between the first and the last presentations each year.

**Table 4: Descriptive statistics for scholars' presentation assessments between first and final (N=7 Years)**

		Mean	SD
Pair 1	Pre Organization	7.78	1.13
	Post Organization	8.91	.48
Pair 2	Pre Clarity	7.23	1.18
	Post Clarity	8.64	.48
Pair 3	Pre Creativity	7.30	1.36
	Post Creativity	8.50	.69
Pair 4	Pre Coherence	7.48	1.06

	Post Coherence	8.74	.38
Pair 5	Pre Understanding	8.14	1.19
	Post Understanding	9.04	.41
Pair 6	Pre Audience Contact	6.94	.97
	Post Audience Contact	8.21	.57
Pair 7	Pre Articulation/Pronunciation	6.29	1.08
	Post Articulation/Pronunciation	7.86	.50
Pair 8	Pre Visual Aids	7.36	1.83
	Post Visual Aids	8.28	.69
Pair 9	Pre English Spelling	6.89	1.67
	Post English Spelling	8.47	.70
Pair 10	Pre English Fluency	6.04	1.20
	Post English Fluency	7.93	.41

**Table 5: Results of paired samples *t* test for scholars' presentation assessments between first and final (N=7 Years)**

		N (7 years)	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
Pair 1	Pre organization - Post organization	7	-1.13	.87	-3.43	6	.01**
Pair 2	Pre clarity - Post clarity	7	-1.41	.88	-4.25	6	.01**
Pair 3	Pre creativity - Post creativity	7	-1.2	1.57	-2.03	6	.09
Pair 4	Pre coherence - Post coherence	7	-1.26	.82	-4.08	6	.01**
Pair 5	Pre understanding - Post understanding	7	-.90	.84	-2.83	6	.03**
Pair 6	Pre audience contact - Post audience contact	7	-1.28	.70	-4.86	6	.00***
Pair 7	Pre articulation/pronunciation - Post articulation/pronunciation	7	-1.57	.63	-6.61	6	.001***
Pair 8	Pre visual aids - Post visual aids	7	-.92	1.61	-1.50	6	.18
Pair 9	Pre English spelling - Post English spelling	7	-1.58	1.17	-3.57	6	.01**
Pair 10	Pre English fluency - Post English fluency	7	-1.89	.83	-6.03	6	.001***

Note: \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

As Tables 4 and 5 indicate, we can be at least 95% confident that the scholars' presentations in the ITPP program had significantly affected scholars in eight of the ten areas with two exceptions in creativity and using visual aids. The eight areas are: organization, clarity, creativity, coherence, general understanding, audience contact, articulation pronunciation, visual aids, English spelling, English fluency; That is, scholars mostly did significantly better in the last presentation than in the first in all seven years.

*The impacts of the United States International Training Program in Pedagogy in Higher Education on visiting scholars in China*

Specifically, in all seven years combined, scholars scored significantly higher in: Organization in the last presentation ( $M = 8.91, SD = 0.48$ ) than in the first presentation ( $M = 7.98, SD = 1.13$ ),  $t(6) = -3.43, p = .01$ ; Clarity in the last presentation ( $M = 8.64, SD = 0.48$ ) than in the first presentation ( $M = 7.23, SD = 1.18$ ),  $t(6) = -4.25, p = .01$ ; Coherence in the last presentation ( $M = 8.74, SD = 0.38$ ) than in the first presentation ( $M = 7.48, SD = 1.06$ ),  $t(6) = -4.08, p = .01$ ; Understanding in the last presentation ( $M = 9.04, SD = 0.41$ ) than in the first presentation ( $M = 8.14, SD = 1.19$ ),  $t(6) = -2.83, p = .03$ ; Audience Contact in the last presentation ( $M = 8.21, SD = 0.57$ ) than in the first presentation ( $M = 6.94, SD = 0.77$ ),  $t(6) = -4.86, p = .00$ ; Articulation/Pronunciation in the last presentation ( $M = 7.86, SD = 0.5$ ) than in the first presentation ( $M = 6.29, SD = 1.08$ ),  $t(6) = -6.61, p = .001$ ; in English Spelling in the last presentation ( $M = 8.47, SD = 0.7$ ) than in the first presentation ( $M = 6.89, SD = 1.67$ ),  $t(6) = -3.57, p = .01$ ; English Fluency in the last presentation ( $M = 7.93, SD = 0.41$ ) than in the first presentation ( $M = 6.04, SD = 1.2$ ),  $t(6) = -6.03, p = .001$ .

Results from the 2020 overall impact survey are reported in Table 6. The percentage of each response in the four items are reported in Tables 7-10.

**Table 6: Descriptive statistics for the assessment of the overall impacts (N=30)**

		Useful to teaching	Useful to students	Useful to programs	Useful to university
N	Valid	30	30	30	30
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.23	4.00	4.17	3.97
SD		0.679	0.788	0.747	0.850

As Table 6 indicates, the means in all four items are about 4 or higher on a 5-point scale. That is, the ITPP has had significant impacts for scholars in all four aspects: teaching, students, programs/ departments, and the university.

**Table 7: Frequency and percentage of each response for useful to teaching (N=30)**

Response Types		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	2- Slightly useful	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
	3- Moderately useful	1	3.3	3.3	6.7
	4- Very useful	18	60.0	60.0	66.7
	5- Extremely useful	10	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

**Table 8: Frequency and percentage of each response for useful to students (N=30)**

Response types		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	2- Slightly useful	1	3.3	3.3	3.3
	3- Moderately useful	6	20.0	20.0	23.3
	4- Very useful	15	50.0	50.0	73.3

	5- Extremely useful	8	26.7	26.7	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

As Table 8 indicates, most scholars think the ITPP program is very useful (50%) or extremely useful (27%) to their own students in China.

**Table 9: The frequency and percentage of each response for useful to programs (N=30)**

Response Types		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	3- Moderately useful	6	20.0	20.0	20.0
	4- Very useful	13	43.3	43.3	63.3
	5- Extremely useful	11	36.7	36.7	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

As Table 9 indicates, most scholars think the ITPP program is very useful (33%) or extremely useful (37%) to their own programs/departments in China.

**Table 10: The frequency and percentage of each response for useful to university (N=30)**

Response types		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	2- Slightly useful	2	6.7	6.7	6.7
	3- Moderately useful	5	16.7	16.7	23.3
	4- Very useful	15	50.0	50.0	73.3
	5- Extremely useful	8	26.7	26.7	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

As Table 10 indicates, most scholars think the ITPP program is very useful (50%) or extremely useful (27%) to their own university in China.

In addition, as mentioned previously, a qualitative content analysis was used to analyse qualitative data. Several major themes or patterns emerged. First, scholars liked the program’s class observation component. Each scholar was provided three courses (one pedagogy related course and two subject related courses) to observe in addition to the Friday seminar. Scholars commented that they enjoyed observation of classes and communication with faculty, as well as learning about teaching ideas and methods from different classes. One scholar commented that “we can touch the life of classroom, engage into the interaction between teacher and student and deep understand the philosophy of pedagogy at SIUE”.

Second, scholars liked the program’s interactions. Scholars could optionally interact with host faculty and students in a variety of ways after class if they wanted to. This could expand scholars’ academic and scholarship interests. Scholars liked that the ITPP program enabled them to experience the teaching and interaction process in American universities. This was a little challenging at the beginning because of the limited scholars’ oral English proficiency but became easier after being in the program for about a month. One scholar commented that they liked “classroom management modes and effective use in teaching, equality between teachers and students in classroom” in

*The impacts of the United States International Training Program in Pedagogy in Higher Education on visiting scholars in China*

the US. One scholar also commented that they liked “The atmosphere of teacher and students interacting with each other”.

Third, scholars liked the Friday Seminar. The program scheduled a Seminar each Friday in which a faculty member who won teaching awards at SIUE was invited to speak to the scholars. One scholar commented that they liked “each Friday when ITPP invited outstanding teachers to share their teaching experience with us”.

Fourth, scholars liked the program's three required presentations, which were open to the public on campus. One scholar commented that this was “a good chance to communicate our life, study and academic with the teachers and students of SIUE”.

Fifth, scholars liked the program’s educational, half-day campus tours to other local private universities. Scholars commented that they enjoyed learning about the operation, curriculum, international student enrolment, and so on of other local private universities.

Sixth, scholars liked the program’s visits to local K-16 schools. The program included visits to local kindergarten, elementary school, middle school, and high school. One scholar commented that “What I like the most is to visit primary school and middle school”.

Finally, scholars liked the program’s local cultural visits. The program provided cultural visits to local sites in the St. Louis metropolitan area in Missouri, and cultural experiences to the local museums and other related sites.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Connection to the literature**

As discussed previously, the ITPP had significant impacts on scholars. They (a) learned the American college teaching pedagogy at SIUE and (b) exhibited different attitudes towards instruction and related practices in China. That is, the research hypotheses were supported. These results are consistent with findings in other studies. For example, according to Xiaoxuan (2004), the faculty “returnee” in China will potentially be leaders in research and education once they apply what they learned in the US.

This study supported Bandura’s (1986) social learning theory. That is, scholar indicated that they did indeed learn by observing classes in the US. They demonstrated they were attentive to the program activities, retained information learned, acted out what information was learned, and were motivated to learn and perform and change their teaching style in China. The results of the pre-post surveys and the presentation surveys all confirmed the scholars' outstanding learning performance in the program. After their return to China, they applied what they had learned from the ITPP into their own teaching regimes. The applications impact at various levels, including teaching, students, programs/departments, and the university; that is, as a result of a change in teaching styles, students, programs/departments, and the university are benefiting.

The study also supported the TTT model. Once the scholars had learned the American college teaching pedagogy, they were able to further train their colleagues and students



in China in the teaching style across the campus and outside the campus. Since the faculty returnees are expected to be leaders in teaching innovatively in universities in China, the impacts could be exponential to faculty, students, programs/disciplines, and the university in the long run. This is consistent with the findings from the overall impact assessment completed in September 2020. In addition, based on recent informal feedback received by the lead author, the administrators at NWNNU in China have been very satisfied with the ITPP.

Third, this study supported the ADDIE instructional model. Since the program was designed and developed based on the scholars' needs and interests, scholars were actively engaged in the program activities. In addition, the program used a variety of data collection methods: pre-post surveys and the presentation surveys to monitor scholars' progress. These methods encouraged scholars to perform well in the program. That is, once scholars had attended the ITPP, they exhibited different teaching attitudes when compared to their teaching attitudes before their participation in the ITPP at SIUE, motivating their students to learn more actively.

Fourth, since there is no existing related research in the field, the ITPP results have the potential to influence higher education pedagogy in NWNNU in China. Based on the lead author's ongoing communication with the university administrators at NWNNU in China, scholars are gradually taking a leadership role in instruction and administration at the university. They are constantly influencing colleagues to teach using the student-oriented instruction method across the campus and even to make an impact outside the campus due to their active participation in related teaching and scholarship activities. Li (2020) asserts that institutions should make such leaders play a larger role in promoting the internationalization of scientific research and teaching as well as international academic exchanges to improve the level of internationalization of Chinese higher education.

### **Implications**

Despite its multiple successes, the ITPP is not perfect, and is subject to minor modifications every year. Feedback from scholars note there are further improvements that could be made to satisfy some scholars' needs:

First, a few scholars suggested extending the program to be six months or one year. This was discussed by the ITPP Leadership Team but was not actioned because of funding from NWNNU. The longer the scholars stay in the US, the more funds NWNNU needs to pay for scholars' stipends at NWNNU and the related administration expenses at SIUE.

Second, a couple of scholars suggested providing more different courses for observation. This was addressed case by case. The Leadership Team accommodated a couple of scholars' requests to add related courses for observation but did not require all scholars to observe more than three courses in order not to overload them.

Third, a couple of scholars suggested providing more opportunities for them to communicate and/or interact with more faculty, students, and the general public at SIUE. The Leadership Team provided some ongoing opportunities for scholars to engage with other people as appropriate. These included speaking to the local senior group and providing guest lectures in some related courses requested by SIUE faculty.

*The impacts of the United States International Training Program in Pedagogy in  
Higher Education on visiting scholars in China*

However, this was considered elective, not required. Otherwise, this would have added extra burdens to some scholars.

Fourth, a couple of scholars suggested allowing bringing children to SIUE during the visit. This was discussed by the ITPP Leadership Team. However, it was not accommodated for practical reasons because scholars were required to observe courses during the day and/or evening and would impact the care of children.

Fifth, a couple of scholars suggested establishing research partnerships with SIUE. In fact, in the latter cohorts, with the Leadership Team's assistance, some scholars made connections to establish individual and/or program-related research partnerships with SIUE.

Sixth, one scholar suggested living separately, not together on campus. This was discussed by the Leadership Team. However, it was not accommodated because of the housing policy at SIUE. Typically, three scholars were arranged to live in one family housing apartment on campus. To accommodate living separately would have meant finding appropriate roommates just for one semester, increasing concern for the safety of the scholars, and increasing scholars' housing expenses.

Seventh, a couple of scholars raised concerns about the language barrier. This is a consistent problem across international programs. Leh et al. (2004) studied the development of an international exchange program for nursing faculty and students to facilitate a better understanding of international health care. They found that the language barrier can be an obstacle to successful international relationships in countries where English is not the primary language.

### **Assumptions and limitations**

There was no assumption that participants should feel compelled to respond favourably to the research surveys. The surveys were directly emailed to the individual scholars to complete by the due date. They were informed that the scholars' own institution was not aware of this study and their responses would not affect their job performance or professional evaluation. However, generalizing from the results of this study should be carried out with caution.

First, the data obtained in this survey may have been influenced by "face" or "lianzi", that is, the personal connections between researchers and participants, particularly the lead author, may have affected participants' responses, and thus the reliability of the responses. In addition, participants were only in the US for one semester. Extending their stay to, say, one year may give a clearer picture of how they changed through the program.

### **CONCLUSION**

This study shows that the ITPP has significantly affected all scholars' attitudes towards instruction and related practices in China. These areas include the impacts on the scholars' teaching, students, programs/departments, and the university. Such results are consistent with the finding by other researchers, such as Clinebell and Kvedaravičienė

(2013). The interactions among various groups of people can make a faculty exchange beneficial to the faculty member, the host, and home institutions, as well as students. The ITPP has, therefore, provided supportive results for sustaining and expanding the current ITPP for administrators at SIUE and at the participating institutions such as NWNNU in China in the future. The ITPP has also enhanced the internationalization efforts at SIUE to help students compete globally, has provided an opportunity for faculty to form international relationships, and has allowed visiting scholars to fully experience the rich American college teaching culture at SIUE and to prepare faculty for teaching their respective disciplines in English.

The findings of this study also support other faculty training programs, such as the residency programs in the medical field (e.g., Camacci et al., 2019). There is a great opportunity for US residency programs to work with international hosts in determining how to structure the international experiences and to shape pre- and post-experience education. In addition, the findings of this study, including the feedback received, suggest that further investigation using other information gathering methods may be beneficial to maximize the benefits to the scholars, as well as to the host communities.

### Acknowledgement

The lead author would like to thank his employer, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, for providing the sabbatical leave in the fall semester of 2020 to complete this manuscript.

### REFERENCES

- Ailinger, R. L., Lange, I. I., & Ailinger, R. L. (2001). International nursing faculty exchange model: A Chile–USA case. *International Nursing Review*, 48(2), 109-116. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1466-7657.2001.00070.x>
- Alaraje, N. & Elaraj, M. S. (2018). Hands across the sea: Lessons learned from the US Fulbright scholar experience in the state of Qatar. *Proceedings of the ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition* (p. 1–7). Salt Lake City, Utah, US.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 290-305.
- Amey, M. J. (2010). Administrative perspectives on international partnerships. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 150, 57-67.
- Ault, D. E., & Martell, K. (2007) The role of international exchange programs to promote diversity on college campuses. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 18(2-3), 153-177. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J066v18n02\\_08](https://doi.org/10.1300/J066v18n02_08).
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.

*The impacts of the United States International Training Program in Pedagogy in Higher Education on visiting scholars in China*

- Banh H. L. & Cave A. (2016). Implementation of a novel train-the-trainer program for pharmacists in China. *Family Medicine & Community Health*, 4(1), 60-63. <https://doi.org/10.15212/FMCH.2016.0104>.
- Biraimah, K. L., & Jotia, A. (2013). The longitudinal effects of study abroad programs on teachers' content knowledge and perspectives: Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad in Botswana and Southeast Asia. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(4), 433-454. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312464378>.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (n. d.). *About Fulbright*. Retrieved from <https://eca.state.gov/fulbright/about-fulbright>.
- Camacci, M. L., Cayton, T. E., & Chen, M. C. (2019). International experiences during United States ophthalmology residency training: Current structure of international experiences and perspectives of faculty mentors at United States training institutions. *PLoS ONE*, 14(11), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0225627>
- Cate, O., T., Mann, K., McCrorie, P., Ponzer, S., Snell, L., & Steinert, Y. (2014). Faculty development through international exchange: The IMEX initiative. *Medical Teacher*, 36(7), 591-595. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2014.899685>
- Center for the Development of Public Health Practice. (1993). *Developing faculty-staff exchange programs between schools of public health and public health agencies: A guide*. The University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Chen, L., et al. (2014). Train-the-Trainer: An effective and successful model to accelerate training and improve physiotherapy services for persons with hemophilia in China. *Haemophilia*, 20(3), 441-445. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hae.12331>
- Clinebell, S. K., & Kvedaravičienė, I. (2013). Facilitating cross-cultural management education through global faculty exchanges. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 24(1), 44-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08975930.2013.810069>
- Cooper, J., & Mitsunaga, R. (2010). Faculty perspectives on international education: The nested realities of faculty collaborations. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 150, 69-81.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018) *Qualitative inquiry and research design choosing among five approaches* (4th ed). Sage.
- Cuenca, A. (2010). Self-study research: Surfacing the art of pedagogy in teacher education. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 3(2), 15-29.
- Dewey, P. & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education, *Higher Education*, 58(4), 491-504.
- Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2004). *The systematic design of instruction* (6th ed.). Pearson, Allyn and Bacon.

- Eddy, P. L. (2014). Faculty as border crossers: A study of Fulbright faculty. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2014(165), 19-30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20080>.
- Farris II, M., Menachof, D., & Crum, M. (2010). Global opportunities via the Fulbright school program. *Transportation Journal*, 49(2), 66-78.
- Fulbright Scholar Program. (n.d.). *Explore programs and awards: Opportunities for US scholars*. Retrieved from <http://www.cies.org/explore-programs-and-awards>
- Fung, S., & Filippo, J. (2002). What kinds of professional international opportunities may be secured for faculty? *New Directions for Higher Education*, (117), 57.
- Gacel-Ávila, J. (2005). The internationalization of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9, 121-136.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational research* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), 330-366.
- Hall, D. E., (2007), "Why professors should teach abroad", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(6), 20.
- Hu, J., Chen, K., & Liu, D. (2020). Chinese university faculty members' visiting experience and professional growth in American universities. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 48(5), e7898.
- International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) (n.d.). *International Leaders in Education Program (ILEP) Request for host university proposals*. Retrieved 1 from [http://irex.org/sites/default/files/u94/ILEP%20RFP\\_March%202012.pdf](http://irex.org/sites/default/files/u94/ILEP%20RFP_March%202012.pdf)
- Jie, Y. (2010). International partnerships: A game theory perspective. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 150, 43-54.
- Knight, J. 2004. Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832>.
- Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy* (Rev. and Updated.). Follet.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage.
- Leh S. K., Robb, W., & Albin J. (2004). The student/faculty international exchange: Responding to the challenges of developing a global perspective in nursing education. *Nursing Education Perspectives (National League for Nursing)*, 25(2), 86-90. Accessed <http://search.ebscohost.com.libproxy.siue.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=12646998&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Leng, S. X., Tian, X., Liu, X., Lazarus, G., Bellantoni, M., Greenough, W., & ... Durso, S. C. (2010). An international model for geriatrics program development in China: The Johns Hopkins-Peking Union Medical College experience. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 58(7), 1376-1381. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2010.02927.x>

*The impacts of the United States International Training Program in Pedagogy in Higher Education on visiting scholars in China*

- Li, H. (2010). Higher education in China: Complement or competition to US universities. In C. T. Clotfelter. (Ed.). *American universities in a global market*. National Bureau of Economic Research Conference Report (pp. 269-304). National Bureau of Economic Research, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Li, Y. (2020). Do returnee faculty promote the internationalization of higher education? A study based on the “2014 Faculty Survey in China”. *Chinese Education & Society*, 53(3), 115-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10611932.2020.1791543>
- Liang, H., & Li, X. (2018). Research on Innovation method of college English translation teaching under the concept of constructivism. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 18(5), 2455-2461. DOI:10.12738/estp.2018.5.145
- Marks B, Sisirak J., & Chang Y. (2013). Efficacy of the health matters program train-the-trainer Model. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*. 2013;26(4):319-334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12045>
- Martel, M., Baer, J., Andrejko, N., & Mason, L. (2020). *Open doors 2020 report on international educational exchange*. Institute of International Education. Accessed from <https://opendoorsdata.org/open-doors-2020-annual-data-release/>
- Miller, R. G. (2000). *The development of global partnerships: The University of Pittsburgh experience*. Paper presented at the Chinese American Librarians Association Annual Meeting, July 9, 2000, Wuhan, China.
- Murphy, P. (2008). *Defining pedagogy*. In K. Hall, P. Murphy & J. Soler (Eds.), *Pedagogy and practice: Culture and identities* (pp. 28-39). Sage.
- Otieno, I. A. & Otieno, T. (2016). Community college-university cross-border partnership through faculty exchange. In Bingley et al. (Eds), *University partnerships for academic programs and professional development (innovations in higher education teaching and learning)* (Vol. 7, pp. 1881-199) Emerald Group Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2055-364120160000007020>
- Phelps, C. (2005). Fulbright of the mind. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(38), C1-C4.
- Rowland, S. (2003). Teaching for democracy in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8(1), 89-101.
- Ross-Gordon, J. (2001). *Contemporary viewpoints on teaching adults effectively*. Jossey-Bass.
- Southern Illinois University Edwardsville (SIUE, n. d.). *Policies & procedures*. Retrieved from <https://www.siue.edu/policies/1q2.shtml>.
- Southern Illinois University (SIUE). (2008). *The Teacher Scholar Philosophy of SIUE*. Retrieved from <https://www.siue.edu/graduate-faculty/pdf/Teacher-Scholar-Philosophy>.
- Torres, J., (2002). *What's in it for me? The whys and wherefores of international exchange programs*. In proceedings of the 2002 ASEE Annual Conference Proceedings, Montréal, Quebec, Canada.

- Turner, J. (2019). Short-term global exchanges through the Fulbright Specialist Program: One librarian's experience. *Portal: Libraries & the Academy*, 19(4), 557–564. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2019.0034>
- US Department of Education. (2012). *Succeeding globally through international education and engagement: US Department of Education international strategy 2012-16*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/international/international-strategy-2012-16.pdf>.
- Wu, X. 2015. A quantitative study of the internationalization of the academics and research productivity: Case study of China. *Chinese Education & Society*, 48(4), 265-79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10611932.2015.1119539>
- Xiaoxuan, L. (2004). A study by the Chinese Academy of Sciences on the benefits of study abroad. *Chinese Education and Society*, 37(2), 61-87.
- Xin, H, Liu, Y., Weishaar, M., & Fricke, G. (2015). A pilot international training program in pedagogy in higher education. *Learning For Democracy*, 6(1), 27-36.
- Zha Q., Wu H, & Hayhoe, R. (2019). Why Chinese universities embrace internationalization: An exploration with two case studies. *Higher Education (00181560)*, 78(4), 669-686. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00364-w>

## APPENDIX 1

Instructions: This is an anonymous survey. Please choose only one answer which fits you the most for each of the following items by choosing the specific number or filling in the blank. The level ranges from 1 (the lowest) to 7 (the highest). Do not leave any items blank. Thanks for your participation.

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I know how to develop a course syllabus in English.                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. I understand American college teaching pedagogy.                                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. I know how to teach in American colleges.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. I know how to use American library resources.                                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. I understand what it means to become a Teacher-Scholar in colleges in the USA.    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. I understand culture and life in the USA.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. I understand the ethics of college teaching in the USA.                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. I know how to interact with faculty from the USA.                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. Write any suggestions below if this program is to be offered again in the future: |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10. Gender: a. Male _____ b. Female _____  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

## APPENDIX 2

### Assessment of the Chinese Scholars' Presentations in English

This instrument will be completed by a member of the Leadership Team during the three formal presentations.

Presenter's Gender: Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_

Presenter's name: \_\_\_\_\_

*The impacts of the United States International Training Program in Pedagogy in Higher Education on visiting scholars in China*

Assessor's Last Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Presentation 1 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*Use the following 1-10 scale to evaluate the presentation:*

1 10	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Unacceptable as Compared to What You Expect Expect from a New SIUE SIUE Assistant Professor</i>			<i>Acceptable as Compared to What You Expect from a New SIUE Assistant Professor</i>			<i>Competent as Compared to What You from a New Assistant Professor</i>		

**I. Presentation Content**

1. Organization 10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
2. Clarity 10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
3. Creativity 10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
4. Coherence 10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
5. General understanding of the topic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

**II. Presentation Delivery**

6. Audience contact 10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. Articulation/Pronunciation 10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. Visual aids 10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

**III. English Language**

9. English spelling 10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. English fluency 10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

**IV. Total  
Score** \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:



### APPENDIX 3

#### Overall impact survey

August 1, 2020

Dear Visiting Scholars,

This survey will be conducted by all NWNNU visiting scholars having recently attended the International Training Program in Pedagogy (ITPP) at SIUE. As the project investigator, I need your participation to help collect data for my study entitled “The Impacts of International Training Program in Pedagogy at SIUE on Visiting Scholars in China”. Please complete all items below by checking only one answer. Your participation will be completely voluntary, confidential, and anonymous. Only group results will be reported in the findings. Thanks for your participation.

- 
1. How useful is the ITPP to your teaching at NWNNU?
    - (1) Not at all useful
    - (2) Slightly useful
    - (3) Moderately useful
    - (4) Very useful
    - (5) Extremely useful
  2. How useful is the ITPP to your students at NWNNU?
    - (1) Not at all useful
    - (2) Slightly useful
    - (3) Moderately useful
    - (4) Very useful
    - (5) Extremely useful
  3. How useful is the ITPP to your programs/discipline/departments at NWNNU?
    - (1) Not at all useful
    - (2) Slightly useful
    - (3) Moderately useful
    - (4) Very useful
    - (5) Extremely useful
  4. How useful is the ITPP to your NWNNU overall?
    - (1) Not at all useful
    - (2) Slightly useful
    - (3) Moderately useful
    - (4) Very useful
    - (5) Extremely useful
  5. Your gender: (1) male      (2) female
  6. Your program/discipline at NWNNU: \_\_\_\_\_ (spell out)
  7. Any suggestions for ITPP to better fit NWNNU in the future?



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA

Authors and readers are free to copy, display and distribute this article with no changes, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and the International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives (IEJ: CP), and the same license applies. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>. The IEJ: CP is published by the Oceania Comparative and International Education Society (formerly ANZCIES) and Sydney Open Access Journals at the University of Sydney. Articles are indexed in ERIC, Scimago Journal (SJR)Ranking / SCOPUS. The IEJ:CP is a member of the Free Journal Network: <https://freejournals.org/>

Join the IEJ: CP and OCIES Facebook community at Oceania Comparative and International Education Society, and Twitter: @OceaniaCIES