

TEACHERS WORKING WITH INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Part I. Socio-demographic data

The sample was composed of 63 respondents. From these, 50 (79.4 %) were women and 13 (20.6 %) were men. The mean age among the sample was 43.03 years (± 9.12 , min. = 28, max. = 65). 50 (79.4 %) respondents were involved in a romantic relationship, while 13 (20.6 %) were single. 61 (96.8 %) respondents lived in an urban area and 2 lived in a rural area (3.2 %). All the respondents were of Romanian nationality.

Variable	Levels	N	%
Gender	Female	50	79.4
	Male	13	20.6
Relationship status	Single	13	20.6
	In a relationship	50	79.4
Environment	Rural	1	1.6
	Urban	62	98.4
Work country	Romania	63	100
Nationality	Romanian	63	100

Part II. Professional data

The respondents indicated they have a mean teaching experience at the university level of 14.52 years (± 8.81 , min. = 1, max. = 30), and that their mean experience in teaching to international students was 9.31 years (± 6.70 , min. = 1, max. = 27).

Regarding the professional data, most participants reported they teach a medical discipline (N = 41, 65.1 %), in contrast with a non-medical discipline (N = 22, 34.9 %). Almost a half of the participants reported that they teach in English only (N = 31, 49.2 %), the rest teaching in French only (N = 9, 14.3 %), in both English and French (N = 12, 19 %) and only in their native language (Romanian) (N = 11, 17.5 %)

Subsequently, the participants were asked how comfortable they feel with the act of teaching in either English or French. For English teaching, only 1 (1.6 %) participant reported that he/she does not feel comfortable teaching. The other participants said they feel somewhat comfortable (N = 9, 14.3 %), comfortable (N = 28, 44.4 %), very comfortable (N = 16, 25.4 %) or extremely comfortable (N = 9, 14.3 %)

Regarding French teaching, however, the respondents felt less comfortable. 26 of them (41.3 %) responded that they were feeling not comfortable, 13 (20.6 %) said that they were somewhat comfortable, 15 (23.8 %) were comfortable, 5 (7.9 %) were very comfortable and 4 (6.3 %) were extremely comfortable.

Finally, the participants were asked whether they attended a training program aimed at teaching international students. 22 participants (39.4 %) said they did. 41 participants (65.1 %) said they did not take part in such training.

Table 2. Professional data

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Levels</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
I teach	Medical discipline	41	65.1
	Non-medical discipline	22	34.9
I teach in	English	31	49.2
	French	9	14.3
	English and French	12	29
	National language	11	17.5
University	University of Oradea	8	12.7
	Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi	44	69.8
	Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca	11	17.5
I attended a training program in teaching international students	No	41	65.1
	Yes	22	39.4
Teaching experience (M±SD)	14.52 (±8.81)	Min 1, max 30	
Experience in teaching international students (M±SD)	9.31 (±6.70)	Min 1, max 27	

Part III. Relationship with international adult learners.

The first instrument assessed the teachers' relationship with international students. This instrument contains 13 items, with a dichotomous response scale, where the answer "Yes" was noted with 1, and the answer "No" was rated with "0". Table 3 presents this instrument's questions and the frequency of the participants' answers.

We observed that 96.8 % of the teachers express an interest in cultural diversity, 87.3 % try to memorize their student's names, and many establish professional relations with some of the students (73 %) and encourage one-on-one meetings with them (79.4 %). Moreover, most teachers believe that international students confide in them about academic difficulties (85.7 %) and that they offer support to international students (66.7 %). Most teachers did not report negative interactions with international students. 73 % did not observe cultural/religious or ethnic conflict between the students and only 25.4 % of them felt that international students did not respect them. Generally, they believe that international students have a good attitude (73 %), and most report they had no conflict with the students (87.5 %). 17.5 % of the teachers reported that they were verbally assaulted by international students and only 1.6 % of them (one teacher) reported that he/she was physically assaulted.

To compute other descriptive statistics for the scale and further analyses, we needed to recode the items describing negative behaviors (items 7-13). Thus, all the included items would be similarly coded, with a higher answer value indicating a good relationship with the students, and a low answer value indicating a bad relationship with the students.

For the entire scale, the possible range would be 13, with a theoretical minimum of 0 (indicating a bad relationship with the students) and a theoretical maximum of 13 (indicating a very good relationship with the students). For this sample, the mean was 10.39 and the standard deviation was 2.37. The minimum was 4 and the maximum was 13.

Table 3. Relationship with international adult learners

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Levels</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
1. I express an interest in cultural diversity.	Yes	61	96.80%
	No	2	3.20%
2. I try to memorize international students' names.	Yes	55	87.30%
	No	8	12.70%
3. I have established close professional relations with some of my international students.	Yes	46	73 %
	No	17	27 %
4. I encourage one-on-one meetings with international students to clarify teaching content.	Yes	50	79.4 %
	No	13	20.6 %
5. International students confide to me about their difficulties in academic and cultural adaptation.	Yes	54	85.7 %
	No	9	14.3 %
6. I provide support to international students outside the academic program to facilitate their academic and cultural adaptation.	Yes	42	66.7 %
	No	21	33.3 %
7. I have noticed cultural/religious/ethnic conflicts between international students in class.	Yes	17	27 %
	No	46	73 %
8. Sometimes I feel that international students do not respect me.	Yes	16	25.4 %
	No	47	74.6 %
9. Sometimes the attitude of international students towards me seems offensive.	Yes	17	27 %
	No	46	73 %
10. I feel uncomfortable when international students speak their mother tongue in class.	Yes	23	36.5 %
	No	40	63.5 %
11. I have had conflicts with some international students.	Yes	9	14.3 %
	No	54	87.5 %
12. I have been verbally assaulted/threatened by at least one international	Yes	11	17.5 %
	No	52	82.5 %
13. I have been physically assaulted by at least one international students.	Yes	1	1.6 %
	No	62	98.4 %

Part IV. Teaching activity with students scale

This scale contains 33 items, rated on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 5 (“strongly agree”). It measures the effectiveness of different teaching activities with international students. Table 4 presents this instrument’s questions, the frequency of the participants’ answers, the mean and standard deviation for each answer.

We also computed descriptive statistics for the entire scale. Thus, the possible range would be 132 with a theoretical minimum of 33 (indicating low effectiveness of teaching strategies) and a theoretical maximum of 155 (indicating high effectiveness of teaching strategies). For this sample, the mean was 124.80 and the standard deviation was 8.54. The minimum was 105 and the

maximum was 141. These results show that, in general, teachers believe they use appropriate and effective teaching activities with international students.

<i>Table 4. Teaching activity with adult learners</i>			
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
1. I believe that practical activities are more effective than theoretical ones in working with international students.	M	4.19	
	SD	0.77	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	3	4.8 %
	Undecided	5	7.9 %
	Agree	32	50.8 %
	Strongly agree	23	36.5 %
2. Activities carried out in small groups of international students are more efficient.	M	4.44	
	SD	0.75	
	Strongly disagree	1	1.6 %
	Disagree	1	1.6 %
	Undecided	1	1.6 %
	Agree	26	41.3 %
	Strongly agree	34	54 %
3. The regular use of audio-video tools is more efficient in working with international students than with national students.	M	3.25	
	SD	1.06	
	Strongly disagree	2	3.2 %
	Disagree	14	22.2 %
	Undecided	22	34.9 %
	Agree	16	25.4 %
	Strongly agree	9	14.3 %
4. Teaching international students seems more difficult than teaching national students.	M	3.36	
	SD	1.19	
	Strongly disagree	5	7.9 %
	Disagree	13	20.6 %
	Undecided	8	12.7 %
	Agree	28	44.4 %
	Strongly agree	9	14.3 %
5. The fact that international students are not fluent in the language of instruction makes the educational process difficult.	M	3.74	
	SD	0.91	

	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	9	14.3 %
	Undecided	9	14.3 %
	Agree	34	54 %
	Strongly agree	11	17.5 %
6. In my work, I have noticed that international students with a larger social network (friends, relatives in our country) get better learning results.	M	3.74	
	SD	0.84	
	Strongly disagree	1	1.6 %
	Disagree	3	4.8 %
	Undecided	17	27 %
	Agree	32	50.8 %
	Strongly agree	10	15.9 %
7. In my work, I have noticed that international students with previous migrant experience adapt more easily to the requirements of the host country.	M	3.61	
	SD	0.83	
	Strongly disagree	1	1.6 %
	Disagree	5	7.9 %
	Undecided	17	27 %
	Agree	34	54 %
	Strongly agree	6	9.5 %
8. In my work, I have noticed that international students tend to interact with students from the same country or with the same cultural background.	M	4.03	
	SD	0.62	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	1	1.6 %
	Undecided	8	12.7 %
	Agree	42	66.7 %
	Strongly agree	12	19 %
9. I believe that the educational counseling services offered by the university to international students facilitate their adaptation.	M	3.84	
	SD	0.62	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	2	3.2 %
	Undecided	12	19 %
	Agree	43	68.3 %
	Strongly agree	6	9.5 %
10. I feel uncomfortable when international students speak their mother tongue in class.	M	2.68	

	SD	1.2	
	Strongly disagree	7	11.1 %
	Disagree	32	50.8 %
	Undecided	3	4.8 %
	Agree	16	25.4 %
	Strongly agree	5	7.9 %
11. The fact that international students have different levels of training makes my teaching difficult.	M	3.26	
	SD	1.01	
	Strongly disagree	2	3.2 %
	Disagree	17	27 %
	Undecided	9	14.3 %
	Agree	32	50.8 %
	Strongly agree	3	4.8 %
12. Sometimes, some behaviors of international students make the didactic activity difficult.	M	3.2	
	SD	1.08	
	Strongly disagree	2	3.2 %
	Disagree	20	31.7 %
	Undecided	9	14.3 %
	Agree	27	42.9 %
	Strongly agree	5	7.9 %
13. I always manage to create equal opportunities for academic success for all international students regardless of culture, religion, ethnicity etc.	M	4.39	
	SD	0.52	0
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Undecided	1	1.6 %
	Agree	36	57.1 %
	Strongly agree	26	41.3 %
14. Working with international students is more challenging than working with national students.	M	3.65	
	SD	0.93	
	Strongly disagree	1	1.6 %
	Disagree	9	14.3 %
	Undecided	9	14.3 %
	Agree	36	57.1 %
	Strongly agree	8	12.7 %
15. Working with international students has changed my view of multiculturalism.	M	4.01	

	SD	0.75	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	4	6.3 %
	Undecided	5	7.9 %
	Agree	40	63.5 %
	Strongly agree	14	22.2 %
16. In general, I am satisfied with the way my professional activity with international students goes.	M	4.07	
	SD	0.6	
	Strongly disagree	1	1.6 %
	Disagree	0	0
	Undecided	3	4.8 %
	Agree	48	76.2 %
	Strongly agree	11	17.5 %
17. I am satisfied with the communication I have with international students.	M	4.03	
	SD	0.47	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	1	1.6 %
	Undecided	3	4.8 %
	Agree	52	82.5 %
	Strongly agree	7	11.1 %
18. I am satisfied with the way I manage to understand the customs and habits of international students.	M	3.9	
	SD	0.55	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	2	2.32 %
	Undecided	7	11.1 %
	Agree	49	77.8 %
	Strongly agree	5	7.9 %
19. I am satisfied with the punctuality of the international students.	M	3.06	
	SD	1.06	
	Strongly disagree	3	4.8 %
	Disagree	20	31.7 %
	Undecided	14	22.2 %
	Agree	22	34.9 %
	Strongly agree	4	6.3 %
20. I am satisfied with the attitude that international students have in my courses / laboratories / tutorials.	M	3.74	
	SD	0.82	

	Strongly disagree	1	1.6 %
	Disagree	5	7.9 %
	Undecided	10	15.9 %
	Agree	40	63.5 %
	Strongly agree	7	11.1 %
21. I prefer frontal interaction in my work with international students.	M	3.77	
	SD	0.83	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	6	9.5 %
	Undecided	12	19 %
	Agree	35	55.6 %
	Strongly agree	10	15.9 %
22. I prefer interactive activities in my work with international students.	M	4.12	
	SD	0.58	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	2	3.2 %
	Undecided	1	1.6 %
	Agree	47	74.6 %
	Strongly agree	13	20.6 %
23. In working with large groups (entire series) of international students I prefer the teacher-to-students flow of information (e.g., lecture / presentation).	M	3.5	
	SD	0.85	
	Strongly disagree	0	
	Disagree	11	17.5 %
	Undecided	13	20.6 %
	Agree	35	55.6 %
	Strongly agree	4	6.3 %
24. In working with small groups of international students I prefer the teacher-to-students flow of information (e.g., consultation / lab / clinical case).	M	3.63	
	SD	0.86	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	10	15.9 %
	Undecided	9	14.3 %
	Agree	38	60.3 %
	Strongly agree	6	9.5 %
25. In working with international students I prefer the students-to-teacher flow of information (e.g., lectures / debate / dissertation / club).	M	3.71	

	SD	0.79	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	27	11.1 %
	Undecided	10	15.9 %
	Agree	40	63.5 %
	Strongly agree	6	9.5 %
26. In working with international students I prefer the students-to-students flow of information (e.g., chat, discussion forum, colloquium).	M	3.73	
	SD	0.7	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	3	4.8 %
	Undecided	17	27 %
	Agree	37	58.7 %
	Strongly agree	6	9.5 %
27. My teaching methods are appropriate for international students.	M	3.8	
	SD	0.56	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	1	1.6 %
	Undecided	14	22.2 %
	Agree	44	69.8 %
	Strongly agree	4	6.3 %
28. I feel comfortable teaching international students.	M	4.04	
	SD	0.6	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	2	3.2 %
	Undecided	4	6.3 %
	Agree	46	73 %
	Strongly agree	11	17.5 %
29. I provide clear criteria for international students regarding participation, topics, evaluation etc.	M	4.23	
	SD	0.46	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Undecided	1	1.6 %
	Agree	46	73 %
	Strongly agree	16	25.4 %
30. I make available to international students all the materials necessary for the study of the discipline I am in charge of.	M	4.3	

	SD	0.46	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	0	0
	Undecided	0	0
	Agree	44	69.8 %
	Strongly agree	19	30.2 %
31. When I prepare my lectures/tutorials/labs I take into consideration the cultural background of international students.	M	3.55	
	SD	0.92	
	Strongly disagree	1	1.6 %
	Disagree	8	12.7 %
	Undecided	17	27 %
	Agree	29	46 %
	Strongly agree	8	12.7 %
32. In delivering teaching content I provide international students with information that helps them adapt more easily to the host country.	M	3.96	
	SD	0.59	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	2	3.2 %
	Undecided	6	9.5 %
	Agree	47	74.6 %
	Strongly agree	8	12.7 %
33. I encourage international students to think critically about the topics I present.	M	4.11	
	SD	0.69	
	Strongly disagree	0	0
	Disagree	2	3.2 %
	Undecided	6	9.5 %
	Agree	38	60.3 %
	Strongly agree	17	27 %

Part V. Difficulties encountered by international students scale

This scale contains 15 items, rated on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (“very difficult”) to 5 (“very easy”). They measure how problematic a teacher thinks that some issues are for international students. Table 5 presents this instrument’s questions, the frequency of the participants’ answers, the mean and standard deviation for each answer.

Table 6 presents a ranking of the most difficult problems encountered by international students, as seen by teachers. 42.9 % of the respondents thought it is difficult for international students to communicate in the language of the instructions and 65.1 % of them said that active

participation in the lectures is hard for international students. However, many teachers believe that international students' problems with discrimination (57.1 %), the hostility of the local people (46 %), or bullying (57.1 %) are neutral. Local arrangements (52.4 %), local transport (60.3 %), the climate (49.2 %), or the eating habits (44.4 %) were seen as important difficulties that make the adaptation harder.

Table 5. Difficulties encountered by international students scale

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Communication in the language of instruction	Mean	2.66	
	SD	0.89	
	Very difficult	4	6.3 %
	Difficult	27	42.9 %
	Neutral	18	28.6 %
	Easy	14	22.2 %
	Very easy	0	0
Active participation in lectures / tutorials / labs	Mean	2.49	
	SD	0.87	
	Very difficult	2	3.2 %
	Difficult	41	65.1 %
	Neutral	8	12.7 %
	Easy	11	17.5 %
	Very easy	1	1.6 %
Understanding local customs and habits	Mean	2.77	
	SD	0.9	
	Very difficult	2	3.2 %
	Difficult	26	41.3 %
	Neutral	21	33.3 %
	Easy	12	19 %
	Very easy	2	3.2 %
Community discrimination	Mean	3.15	
	SD	0.74	
	Very difficult	1	1.6 %
	Difficult	8	12.7 %
	Neutral	36	57.1 %
	Easy	16	25.4 %
	Very easy	2	3.2 %
Hostility of local people	Mean	3.06	
	SD	0.91	
	Very difficult	4	6.3 %
	Difficult	10	15.9 %
	Neutral	29	46 %

	Easy	18	28.6 %
	Very easy	2	3.2 %
Colleagues' Bullying	Mean	3.14	
	SD	0.83	
	Very difficult	0	0
	Difficult	12	19 %
	Neutral	36	57.1 %
	Easy	9	14.3 %
	Very easy	6	9.5 %
Community integration	Mean	2.71	
	SD	0.9	
	Very difficult	2	3.2 %
	Difficult	30	47.6 %
	Neutral	16	25.4 %
	Easy	14	22.2 %
	Very easy	1	1.6 %
Loneliness	Mean	3.47	
	SD	0.85	
	Very difficult	0	0
	Difficult	8	12.7 %
	Neutral	24	38.1 %
	Easy	24	38.1 %
	Very easy	7	11.1 %
Making friends	Mean	2.55	
	SD	0.79	
	Very difficult	1	1.6 %
	Difficult	36	57.1 %
	Neutral	17	27 %
	Easy	8	12.7 %
	Very easy	1	1.6 %
Living arrangements	Mean	2.69	
	SD	0.89	
	Very difficult	1	1.6 %
	Difficult	33	52.4 %
	Neutral	14	22.2 %
	Easy	14	22.2 %
	Very easy	1	11.6 %
Employment	Mean	3.42	
	SD	0.92	
	Very difficult	2	3.2 %

	Difficult	7	11.1 %
	Neutral	22	34.9 %
	Easy	26	41.3 %
	Very easy	6	9.5 %
Local transport	Mean	2.42	
	SD	0.73	
	Very difficult	2	3.2 %
	Difficult	38	60.3 %
	Neutral	18	28.6 %
	Easy	4	6.3 %
	Very easy	1	1.6 %
Adaptation to the climate of the host country	Mean	2.69	
	SD	0.77	
	Very difficult	0	0
	Difficult	31	49.2 %
	Neutral	20	31.7 %
	Easy	12	19 %
	Very easy	0	0
Keeping eating habits from the country of origin	Mean	2.77	
	SD	0.92	
	Very difficult	2	3.2 %
	Difficult	28	44.4 %
	Neutral	16	25.4 %
	Easy	16	25.4 %
	Very easy	1	1.6 %
Access to quality medical services	Mean	2.71	
	SD	1.08	
	Very difficult	4	6.3 %
	Difficult	30	47.6 %
	Neutral	15	23.8 %
	Easy	8	12.7 %
	Very easy	6	9.5 %

We observe that the teachers consider that international students have a rather difficult adaption in their host country. 42.9 % of the respondents thought it is difficult for international students to communicate in the language of the instructions and 65.1 % of them said that active participation in the lectures is hard for international students. However, many teachers believe that international students' problems with discrimination (57.1 %), the hostility of the local people (46 %), or bullying (57.1 %) are neutral. Local arrangements (52.4 %), local transport (60.3 %), the climate (49.2 %), or the eating habits (44.4 %) were seen as important difficulties that make the adaptation harder.

We also computed descriptive statistics for the entire scale. Thus, the possible range would be 60 with a theoretical minimum of 15 (indicating a difficult coping process) and a theoretical maximum of 75 (indicating an extremely easy coping process). For this sample, the mean was 42.79 and the standard deviation was 7.59. The minimum was 27 and the maximum was 61.

Table 6. Ranking of the most important difficulties for international students, according the teachers

Rank	Issue	Mean
1 (most problematic)	Local transport	2.42
2	Active participation in lectures / tutorials / labs	2.49
3	Making friends	2.55
4	Communication in the language of instruction	2.66
5	Living arrangements	2.69
6	Adaptation to the climate of the host country	2.69
7	Community integration	2.71
8	Access to quality medical services	2.71
9	Understanding local customs and habits	2.77
10	Keeping eating habits from the country of origin	2.77
11	Hostility of local people	3.06
12	Colleagues' Bullying	3.14
13	Community discrimination	3.15
14	Employment	3.42
15 (least problematic)	Loneliness	3.47

Part VI. Approaches to Teaching Inventory

Developed by Trigwell and Proser (2004), this scale measures two different approaches that can be used by the teacher. One is focused on the teacher and emphasizes the transmission of information (ITTF) and one is focused on the student and emphasizes conceptual change (CCSF). Both approaches are synthesized into different subscales of the instrument. Thus, ITTF contains 8 items (1,2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13) and the CCSF also contains 8 items (3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16). All the items are measure on a Likert-type scale, from 1 (“only rarely”) to 5 (“almost always”). For the ITTF sub-scale, internal consistency (measured with the Cronbach’s Alpha) was 0.75 and for the CCSF sub-scale, the coefficient was 0.768. Table 7 presents this instrument’s questions, the frequency of the participants’ answers, the mean and standard deviation for each answer.

Further analyses were computed separately for each sub-scale. For both sub-scales, the possible range would be 32 with a theoretical minimum of 8 (indicating an exceptionally low use of the strategy) and a theoretical maximum of 40 (indicating a high use of the strategy). For the ITTF sub-scale, the mean was 27.11 (\pm 5.34), the minimum was 16 and the maximum was 39. For the CCSF the mean was 28.31 (\pm 5.18), the minimum was 14 and the maximum was 40.

We also run a *Paired Sample T-test analysis* to verify whether one strategy is preferred over the other. The results show that although the respondents use CCSF more, the difference is not significant ($t = -1.74$; $p = .085$). In terms of individual answers, 30 respondents (47.6 %) said they use more CCSF, 8 respondents (12.7 %) use both strategies equally and 25 (39.7 %) use ITTF more.

Table 7. Approaches to Teaching Inventory

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
1. I design my teaching in this subject with the assumption that most of the students have very little useful knowledge of the topics to be covered.	M	3.39	
	SD	1.14	
	only rarely	3	4.8 %
	sometimes	14	22.2 %
	about half of the time	11	17.5 %
	frequently	25	39.7 %
	almost always	10	15.9 %
2. I feel it is important that this subject should be completely described in terms of specific objectives relating to what students have to know for formal assessment items.	M	3.84	
	SD	0.84	
	only rarely	0	0
	sometimes	8	12.7 %
	about half of the time	4	6.3 %
	frequently	41	65.1 %
	almost always	10	15.9 %
3. In my interaction with students in this subject I try to develop a conversation with them about the topics we are studying.	M	4.26	
	SD	0.74	
	only rarely	0	0
	sometimes	2	3.2 %
	about half of the time	5	7.9 %
	frequently	30	47.6 %
	almost always	26	41.3 %
4. I feel it is important to present a lot of facts to students so that they know what they have to learn for this subject.	M	4.04	
	SD	0.79	
	only rarely	0	0
	sometimes	5	7.9 %
	about half of the time	3	4.8 %
	frequently	39	61.9 %
	almost always	16	25.4 %
5. I feel that the assessment in this subject should be an opportunity for students to reveal their changed conceptual understanding of the subject.	M	3.76	
	SD	0.91	
	only rarely	1	1.6 %
	sometimes	7	11.1 %
	about half of the time	8	12.7 %
	frequently	37	358.7 %
	almost always	10	15.9 %
	M	3.06	

6. I set aside some teaching time so that the students can discuss, among themselves, the difficulties that they encounter studying this subject.	SD	1.31	
	only rarely	10	15.9 %
	sometimes	15	23.8 %
	about half of the time	6	9.5 %
	frequently	25	39.67 %
	almost always	7	11.1 %
7. In this subject I concentrate on covering the information that might be available from a good textbook.	M	3.42	
	SD	1.16	
	only rarely	2	3.2 %
	sometimes	17	27 %
	about half of the time	7	11.1 %
	frequently	26	41.3 %
	almost always	11	17.5 %
8. I encourage students to restructure their existing knowledge in terms of the new way of thinking about the subject that they will develop.	M	3.82	
	SD	0.97	
	only rarely	1	1.6 %
	sometimes	9	14.3 %
	about half of the time	3	4.8 %
	frequently	37	58.7 %
	almost always	13	20.6 %
9. In teaching sessions for this subject, I use difficult or undefined examples to provoke debate.	M	2.79	
	SD	1.28	
	only rarely	11	17.5 %
	sometimes	20	31.7 %
	about half of the time	9	14.3 %
	frequently	17	27 %
	almost always	6	9.5 %
10. I structure this subject to help students to pass the formal assessment items.	M	3.63	
	SD	0.95	
	only rarely	0	0
	sometimes	11	17.5 %
	about half of the time	11	17.5 %
	frequently	31	49.2 %
	almost always	10	15.9 %
11. I think an important reason for running teaching sessions in this subject is to give students a good set of notes.	M	2.96	
	SD	1.3	
	only rarely	12	19 %
	sometimes	12	19 %

	about half of the time	11	17.5 %
	frequently	22	34.9 %
	almost always	6	9.5 %
12. In this subject, I only provide the students with the information they will need to pass the formal assessment.	M	2.14	
	SD	1.3	
	only rarely	30	47.6 %
	sometimes	11	17.5 %
	about half of the time	7	11.1 %
	frequently	13	20.6 %
	almost always	2	3.2 %
13. I feel that I should know the answers to any questions that the students may put to me during this subject.	M	3.65	
	SD	1.23	
	only rarely	5	7.9 %
	sometimes	10	15.9 %
	about half of the time	2	3.2 %
	frequently	31	49.2 %
	almost always	15	23.8 %
14. I make available opportunities for students in this subject to discuss their changing understanding of the subject.	M	3.82	
	SD	0.97	
	only rarely	1	1.6 %
	sometimes	7	11.1 %
	about half of the time	9	14.3 %
	frequently	31	49.2 %
	almost always	15	23.8 %
15. I feel that it is better for students in this subject to generate their own notes rather than always copy mine.	M	3.41	
	SD	1.04	
	only rarely	1	1.6 %
	sometimes	14	22.2 %
	about half of the time	15	23.8 %
	frequently	24	38.1 %
	almost always	9	14.3 %
16. I feel a lot of teaching time in this subject should be used to question students' ideas.	M	3.36	
	SD	1.02	
	only rarely	1	1.6 %
	sometimes	14	22.2 %
	about half of the time	17	27 %
	frequently	23	36.5 %
	almost always	8	12.7 %

Statistical analysis – teachers of international students

To analyze the data, we employed several statistical methods: *Spearman correlations, independent samples t-tests, one-way ANOVAs*. The analysis revealed some important results which are detailed according to the tests used.

Correlational analysis

The correlational analyses revealed several correlations between the ATI (items from the 6th section of our instrument) and the relationship with international students (3rd part of our instrument):

For ATTF

- The more teacher-oriented the respondents were, the less they have been verbally assaulted by the students ($r = -.27, p = .03$).

The correlational analyses revealed several correlations between the ATI (items from the 6th section of our instrument) and the teaching activity (4th part of our instrument):

For ATTF

- The more teacher-oriented the respondents were, the more they believe that teaching international students was more difficult than teaching national students ($r = .36, p = .003$).
- The more teacher-oriented the respondents were, the more they prefer the teacher-to-student flow of information, in large groups ($r = .25, p = .04$) or in small groups ($r = .43, p < .001$).

For CCSF

- The more student-oriented the teachers were, the more they noticed that larger social networks help students get better learning results ($r = .33, p < .01$).
- The more student-oriented the teachers were, the more they teacher to students flow of information ($r = .37, p < .01$).

The correlational analyses revealed several correlations between the ATI (items from the 6th section of our instrument) and difficulties encountered by international students, as seen by the teachers (5th part of our instrument):

For ATTF

- The more teacher-oriented the respondents were, the less they consider students were not affected by difficulties such as community integration ($r = -.27, p = .02$), employment ($r = -.45, p < .001$), climate ($r = -.32, p < .01$), eating habits ($r = -.37, p < .01$) or access to medical services ($r = -.35, p < .01$).

For CSSF

- The more student-oriented the teachers were, the more they believe the students are not affected by community discrimination ($r = .27, p = .03$).

We found one significant correlation between age and the relationship with international students (3rd part of our instrument):

- The younger teachers were, the more they tried to memorize the names of their students ($r = -.38, p < .01$)

We found one significant correlation between age and teaching activity (4th part of our instrument):

- The younger teachers were, the more they tried to provide more clear criteria for international students regarding participation, topic, and evaluation ($r = -.351, p = .005$).

The correlational analyses revealed several correlations between age and difficulties encountered by international students, as seen by the teachers (5th part of our instrument):

- The younger the teachers were, the less difficult they thought loneliness was for international students ($r = -.360, p = .004$). Also, the younger the teachers were, the less they thought that local transport was a difficult problem for the students ($r = -.368, p = .003$)

We found several significant correlations between teaching experience and the relationship with international students (3rd part of our instrument):

- The less experienced the teachers were, the more they tried to memorize their students' names ($r = -.40, p < .001$).

- The more experienced in working with international students they were, the more they tried to establish close professional relationships with the students ($r = .40, p < .001$)

- The more experienced they were in working with international students, the more they encouraged one-on-one meetings ($r = .24, p = .05$).

- The less experienced the teachers were in working with international students, the more they observed cultural or ethnic conflicts among the students ($r = -.40, p < .001$).

- The less experienced the teachers were in working with international students, the more they had conflicts with the students ($r = -.28, p < .02$), and the more they were verbally assaulted ($r = -.27, p < .03$).

We found several significant correlations between teaching experience and teaching activity (4th part of our instrument):

- The less experienced the teachers were in working with international students, the more they believed audio-video tools are efficient in working with the international students ($r = -.28, p < .02$).

- The less experienced the teachers were, the more they thought group activities are efficient in working with international students ($r = -.33, p = .007$).

- The less experienced the teachers were in working with international students, the more noticed that previous migrant experiences help international students to adapt easier ($r = -.28, p < .02$).

We found one significant correlation between being comfortable with teaching in French and the relationship with international students (3rd part of our instrument):

- The more comfortable the teachers were with teaching in French, the more they considered they established close professional relationships with some students ($r = .26, p = .04$).

We found several significant correlations between being comfortable with teaching in French and teaching activity (4th part of our instrument):

- The more comfortable the teachers were with teaching in French, the less they considered that audio-video tools are more efficient in working with international students compared to native ones ($r = -.28, p = .02$).

- The more comfortable the teachers were with teaching in French, the less they considered that the students that are not fluent in the language of instruction make the educational process more difficult ($r = -.28$, $p = .02$).

- The more comfortable the teachers were with teaching in French, the less they considered that students having different levels of training make teaching difficult ($r = -.37$, $p = .003$).

We found several significant correlations between being comfortable with teaching in French and difficulties encountered by international students, as seen by the teachers (5th part of our instrument):

- The more comfortable the teachers were with teaching in French, the more they considered that communication in the language of instruction is a difficulty for the students ($r = -.26$, $p = .03$).

- The more comfortable the teachers were with teaching in French, the less they used CCSF teaching strategies (focused on students) ($r = -.37$, $p = .002$).

Independent sample T-tests

- We found that women ($M = 4.46$), more than men ($M = 4.15$) consider that they succeed to create equal opportunities for international students regardless of their race, religion and ethnicity ($t = 2.36$, $p = .025$).

- We found that women ($M = 4.36$), more than men ($M = 4.07$) consider that they make available all the necessary materials for the international students ($t = 2.74$, $p = .01$).

- We found that women ($M = 4.06$), more than men ($M = 3.61$) consider that when delivering content, they help international students to adapt better ($t = 2.72$, $p = .013$).

- We found that the teachers who teach medical disciplines ($M = 3.95$) prefer frontal interaction more, compared with those who teach non-medical disciplines ($M = 3.45$) ($t = 2.19$, $p = 0.03$).

- We found that the teachers who teach medical disciplines ($M_{\text{large group}} = 3.73$; $M_{\text{small group}} = 3.80$), more than those who teach non-medical disciplines ($M_{\text{large group}} = 3.09$; $M_{\text{small group}} = 3.31$) prefer teacher-to-student flow of information when working with large ($t = 2.81$, $p = 0.008$) or small groups of international students ($t = 2.18$, $p = .03$).

- We found that the teachers who teach non-medical disciplines ($M = 4.00$), more than those who teach medical disciplines ($M = 3.58$) prefer student-to-student flow of information when working with international students ($t = -2.71$, $p = .01$).

- We found that the teachers who teach non-medical disciplines ($M = 4.04$), more than those who teach medical disciplines ($M = 3.68$) consider that their teaching methods are appropriate for international students ($t = -2.91$, $p = .005$).

- We found that the teachers who teach medical disciplines ($M = 2.46$) consider that communication in the language of instruction is more difficult for the students, compared with those who teach non-medical disciplines ($M = 3.04$) ($t = -2.56$, $p = 0.13$).

- We found that the teachers who teach medical disciplines ($M = 2.41$) consider that living arrangements are more difficult for the students, compared with those who teach non-medical disciplines ($M = 3.22$) ($t = -3.86$, $p < .001$).

- We found that the teachers who teach medical disciplines ($M = 2.29$) consider that local transport is more difficult for the students, compared with those who teach non-medical disciplines ($M = 2.68$) ($t = -2.05$, $p = .04$).
- We found that the teachers who teach medical disciplines ($M = 2.51$) consider that adaptation to the climate is more difficult for the students, compared with those who teach non-medical disciplines ($M = 3.04$) ($t = -2.75$, $p = .008$).
- We found that the teachers who teach medical disciplines ($M = 2.49$) consider that the access to medical services is more difficult for the students, compared with those who teach non-medical disciplines ($M = 3.22$) ($t = -2.91$, $p = .005$).
- The teachers who undertook a training program aimed at working with international students ($M = .81$), compared with those who did not ($M = .58$), provide more support to international students outside of the academic program ($t = -2.03$, $p = 0.04$).
- Teachers who did not undertake training ($M = 3.58$), more than those who did ($M = 2.63$), consider that the use of audio-video tools is more efficient in working with international students, compared to national students ($t = 3.71$, $p < .001$).
- Teachers who did not undertake training ($M = 3.95$), more than those who did ($M = 3.36$), consider international students' lack of language proficiency make the educational process more difficult ($t = 2.53$, $p < .01$).
- The teachers who undertook a training program aimed at working with international students ($M = 4.31$), compared with those who did not ($M = 3.95$), are more satisfied with their activity ($t = -2.38$, $p = 0.02$).

One Way Anova

- The One Way Anova analysis based on the language of teaching (English vs French vs national vs English and French) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers reported they have been verbally assaulted by the students ($F = 3.11$, $p = .03$). The respondents teaching only in French ($M = 1.00$) reported higher scores compared to those who teach in English and French ($M = .54$), but not compared to the other two categories.
- The One Way Anova analysis based on the language of teaching (English vs French vs national vs English and French) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers consider that communication in the language of instruction is difficult for students ($F = 4.10$, $p = .01$). The respondents teaching only in French ($M = 2.00$) reported lower scores compared to those who teach in the native language ($M = 3.25$), but not compared to the other two categories.
- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers feel uncomfortable when the students speak their mother tongues in class ($F = 5.016$, $p = .01$). The teachers from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 1.00$) have significantly higher scores compared to those from Gr. T. Popa University ($M = .59$) and the University of Oradea ($M = .37$).
- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers consider that it is more difficult to teach international students than national

students ($F = 6.79$, $p = .002$). The teachers from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 2.27$) have significantly lower scores compared to those from Gr. T. Popa University ($M = 3.63$).

- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers consider that the students' lack of fluency in English makes the teaching difficult ($F = 3.55$, $p = .035$). The teachers from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 3.18$) have significantly lower scores compared to those from Gr. T. Popa University ($M = 3.93$).

- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers consider that international students changed their view on multiculturalism ($F = 4.09$, $p = .022$). The teachers from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 4.54$) have significantly higher scores compared to those from Gr. T. Popa University ($M = 3.86$).

- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers are satisfied with the communication they have with the international students ($F = 3.72$, $p = .03$). The teachers from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 4.36$) have significantly higher scores compared to those from Gr. T. Popa University ($M = 3.97$).

- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers prefer frontal interaction when working with international students ($F = 3.79$, $p = .02$). The teachers from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 3.18$) have significantly lower scores compared to those from Gr. T. Popa University ($M = 3.88$).

- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers feel comfortable teaching international students ($F = 5.70$, $p = .005$). The teachers from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 4.54$) have significantly higher scores compared to those from Gr. T. Popa University ($M = 3.97$) and the University of Oradea ($M = 3.75$).

- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers consider community integration a more serious problem for international students ($F = 5.81$, $p = .005$). The teachers from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 3.45$) have significantly higher scores compared to those from Gr. T. Popa University ($M = 2.50$), thus considering the issue less problematic.

- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers consider adaptation to the climate a more serious problem for international students ($F = 4.06$, $p = .022$). The teachers from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 3.27$) have significantly higher scores compared to those from Gr. T. Popa University ($M = 2.59$), thus considering the issue less problematic.

- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers consider keeping the eating habits from the native country a more serious problem for international students ($F = 3.91, p = .025$). The teachers from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 3.45$) have significantly higher scores compared to those from Gr. T. Popa University ($M = 2.63$), thus considering the issue less problematic.

- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers consider the access to quality medical services a more serious problem for international students ($F = 4.47, p = .015$). The teachers from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 3.54$) have significantly higher scores compared to those from Gr. T. Popa University ($M = 2.56$), thus considering the issue less problematic.

- The One Way Anova analysis based on the institutional affiliation (Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Iasi, Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Cluj-Napoca and University of Oradea) reveal that there are differences in the level at which teachers use student-focused teaching ($F = 9.77, p < .001$). The teachers from the University of Oradea ($M = 34.75$) have higher scores compared to those from Iuliu Hatieganu University ($M = 25.90$) and Gr. T. Popa University ($M = 27.75$).

Part VII. Open-ended questions

Q1 – In my opinion, the three most challenging aspects when teaching international students are:

Some respondents offered less than three answers. Thus, fewer units of text could be extracted from their answers. The 153 units of text were grouped into 5 categories. The results can be seen in Table 8. The most frequent category was “teaching process”, followed by “culture”, “students' behavior and knowledge”, “language” and “organizing activity”.

Category	Frequency	Examples
Teaching process	54	“Reaching all the students, despite the lack of interest manifested by some of them”, “Creating good working relationships between the students with different cultural backgrounds”, “The materials and methods that I use, the number of hours available”, “To find the appropriate level of knowledge for everybody, to keep them interested in the subject and to motivate them to study”, “Fear of not raising enough their interest in the subject”
Culture	37	“Cultural background”, “Diversity”, “Culturally- marked study skills”, “Different international medical approaches”
Students' behavior and knowledge	29	“Some of them speak in the same time, delays, some of them do not collaborate in discussions”, “Students' interest for professional skills”.

Language	28	“Explaining a subject using different methods, to make sure students understand, because of their poor knowledge of English language.”, “Teaching in a foreign language”, “Overcoming the language and accent barrier”
Organising activity	5	“The few international students I have taught until now ended up in my classes for various administrative reasons not necessarily related to how my courses are aimed to support students' interests, learning, and development.”, “Respecting rules”, “Fraud during exams”

Q2 – In my opinion, the three most challenging aspects international students must face when coming to study in my institution are:

Some respondents offered less than three answers. Thus, fewer units of text could be extracted from their answers. The 150 units of text were grouped into 7 categories. The results can be seen in Table 9. The most frequent category was “culture”, followed by “language”, “teaching process”, “social support”, “native culture and institutions”, “professional difficulties” and “students' behavior and knowledge”.

Table 9. Selected categories for Question 2

Category	Frequency	Examples
Culture	37	“Adapting to Romanian habits and people”, “To adapt to local cultural particularities”, “Religion differences”
Language	35	“Different levels of language proficiency”
Teaching process	25	“Our institution, our academic community, as well as we individually are used to placing ourselves at the center of how we perceive reality. This undermines our ability to see, understand, appreciate, and accommodate someone else's perspective of the same situation”, “Overloaded timetable, lots of things to learn by heart, heterogeneous groups, with vastly different motivation/knowledge.”
Social support	16	“Finding new friends among the classmates”, “Manage themselves with the life far away from their parents, having less friends at the beginning”
Native culture and institutions	12	“Bureaucracy”, “Respect to the specific rules”, “New customs”, “Understand the Romanian education system”
Professional difficulties	10	“To have more access to the practical activity in the hospital”, “Study in a country with other opportunities to treat patients (may be lower) and the opportunity to stay face to face with patients.”
Students' behavior and knowledge	5	“Level of knowledge”, “Honesty”, “Love to learn”

Q3 – The best three strategies I use when teaching international students are:

Some respondents offered less than three answers. Thus, fewer units of text could be extracted from their answers. The 92 units of text were grouped into 12 categories. The results can be seen in Table 10. The most frequent category was “encourage the students' opinions”, followed by “encourage collaboration”, “student-centered strategies”, “using cultural inclusion”, “pedagogical tact”, “group work”, “using online tools and multimedia”, “case studies”, “Language proficiency”, “humor”, “individual work”, and “practical activities”.

Table 10. Selected categories for Question 3

Category	Frequency	Examples
Encourage the students' opinions	16	“Asking questions and being sincerely interested in their impressions, habits, way of thinking”, “Allow them to freely express their opinions”
Encourage collaboration	14	“Use debates”, “Interaction, creating opportunities to discover more”
Student-centered strategies	14	“Asking questions and being sincerely interested in their impressions, habits, way of thinking”, “I let them speak more than I do. I choose topics that they find interesting. I praise them a lot.”, “Use problem-based learning”, “Professional disponibility”
Using cultural inclusion	12	“Talk about their country and how they adapted to Romania “,
Pedagogical tact	10	“Explain technical terms, create a positive classroom experience”, “Be patient”, “Constantly checking to see if they understand the task”, “Providing clear and concise information”
Group work	8	“Working in small groups (sometimes they choose their teammates, others I choose for them)”, “Team working, learning through experience, inquiry-based learning”
Using online tools and multimedia	6	“Use of videos, drawing”
Case studies	6	“Cases discussions”, “Presentation of interesting cases”
Language proficiency	3	“Try to teach them the basic vocabulary”, “Ludic approach to new language”, “Practice for pronunciation, a lot of vocabulary (what they want)”
Humor	1	Humor
Individual work	1	“Work with them individually if necessary, to close up gaps in knowledge or execution if there is such”
Practical activities	1	“interaction with patients and putting the students in the role of doctors”

Q4 – The three most common complaints about my work with international students are:

Some respondents offered less than three answers. Thus, fewer units of text could be extracted from their answers. The 66 units of text were grouped into 7 categories. The results can be seen in Table 11. The most frequent category was “discipline”, followed by “language”, “institutional organization”, “difficulty of the course”, “teaching style”, “lack of time” and “cultural differences”.

Table 11. Selected categories for Question 4

Category	Frequency	Examples
Discipline	25	“I am too strict”, “No positive discrimination at final tests”, “They are sometimes dissatisfied with their grades (most of them only until I explain why)”
Language	13	“Not providing enough speaking activities for them”, “Language level”
Institutional organization	12	“Enrolment”, “Big number of students in the class”, “The course is too early in the timetable”, “Large groups, little time, poor infrastructure”
Difficulty of the course	8	“What I teach is too difficult”, “Too much information to learn”, “Time constraints. More practice. Understanding some of the concepts”
Teaching style	5	“I am exigent, punctual, I do not tolerate them to be disrespectful”, “I am a fast talker”
Lack of time	2	“Not enough time for one-to-one interactions”, “Groups too large, meetings too long and too rare”
Cultural differences	1	“Different cultures, different backgrounds”

Q5 - In what ways have you encouraged collaborative learning among international students?

The 63 units of text were grouped into 7 categories. The results can be seen in Table 12. The most frequent category was “group learning”, followed by “open communication”, “create multicultural opportunities”, “develop personal relationships”, “extracurricular activities”, “teacher-student relationships” and “the use of different material”.

Table 12. Selected categories for Question 5

Category	Frequency	Examples
Group learning	35	“Encourage teamwork”, “Work in small teams”, “Provide the possibility (in small groups of 2-3 students) to get involved in medical and surgical activity.”
Open communication	12	“I encourage them to speech a out their problems.”, “Initiate many discussions on topics of the lectures/seminars.”, “During my class they are always encouraged to express their thoughts on the matter. I tell them to share their opinions even if different so long as they bring a logical argument to back it up and they remain open to other opinions.”
Create multicultural opportunities	6	“Encourage mixed ethnic work”, “I like to form mixed groups so they get the chance to interact with other students from different backgrounds. Some tasks focus on them discovering similarities and differences and reporting back to the class the results of their discussions.”
Develop personal relationships	3	“From the beginning of the lectures I invite them to make friends from different culture and become friends.”, “Facilitating connections among them.”

Extracurricular activities	3	“Help students attend university organized projects”, “I encourage them to prepare scientific work for congresses, in groups.”
Teacher - students relationship	3	“Offer license support, questions and answer sessions.”, “Keeping a close relation with them.”
The use different materials	1	“The students had to watch a movie or to read a paper for each laboratory. Based on this support, they had to express their opinions on some relevant topics and to read their opinions during the class.”

Q6 - What have you learned from international students?

Some respondents offered more complex answers. Thus, more than one unit of text could be extracted from their answers. The 71 units of text were grouped into 8 categories. The results can be seen in Table 13. The most frequent category was “multicultural development”, followed by “personal development”, “teaching practices”, “general knowledge”, “language improvement”, “aspects of personal relationships”, “humor” and “mobility.”

Table 13. Selected categories for Question 6

Category	Frequency	Examples
Multicultural development	24	“To listen without prejudice, to abstain from passing judgment, to examine my own perspective, to appreciate diversity”, “To be more multicultural”, “Cultural differences are good for both of the us”, “Diversity is a great stimulus for growth, both theirs and mine”, “Listen to their stories, look at their life circumstances and background. We are all one, with the same basic needs, also welcome the differences that make each group, each class so special and enjoyable. Love each nation, each country as we love our own.”
Personal development	17	“To be flexible”, “To be always open”, “Courage, that I need to establish boundaries”
Teaching practice	15	“To be patient with the students”, “To listen more to the students”, “To be more tolerant in the classroom” , “Abstain from criticism and always appreciate progress and proper attitude, (kindness, patience and hard work).”
General knowledge	5	“I have learned about different countries’ medical systems”, “Sociocultural issues” “Words in their language. Medicinal plants in their country. Recipes and travel tips”
Language improvement	5	“To improve my foreign language proficiency”, “I practiced my French by talking to native French speakers”
Aspects of personal relationships	2	“The constant desire to communicate with teachers and other students/colleagues “
Humor	2	“They have the sense of humor “, “Humor doesn't travel easy across the cultures”
Mobility	1	“Educational mobility “

THE PROFILE OF THE TEACHER WORKING WITH INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

63 respondents participated in this study. Most of them teach a medical discipline and have a teaching experience of more than 10 years. Also, most of the participants teach in English or both English and French. The respondents are more comfortable with teaching in English and less comfortable with teaching in French. Finally, most of them did not take any courses to prepare for teaching international students.

The teachers have a mostly good relationship with international students. They express interest in cultural diversity, try to memorize the names of the students, and even establish close professional relations with the students, encouraging one-on-one meetings to discuss, among others, the students' difficulties in academic and cultural adaptation. Still, some teachers feel that the students do not respect them and have some offensive attitudes. Besides, some teachers feel uncomfortable when international students speak their mother tongue in class. However, most teachers did not encounter such problems. Few teachers reported having conflicts with international students and only one reported being physically assaulted by a student. By studying the data from qualitative and quantitative standpoints, the lack of a proper relationship between the teacher and the students seems to be the exception, rather than the norm.

The teachers from this sample prefer practical activities rather than theoretical ones, use various multimedia sources and tools, and prefer to work in smaller groups. However, they consider that teaching international students is more difficult than teaching native students. The language and the difficulties in adapting to the host culture seem to be important issues for international students, as seen by the teachers. While considering various problems with the teaching process, the teachers seem to be content with their ability to use appropriate methods for working with international students. They try to inform and to help students to adapt better and more quickly. Finally, the teachers who teach only in French seem to believe that their activity is less effective.

The teachers believe that international students encounter a variety of problems, some more troublesome than the others. The most problematic issues would be related to local transport, participation in the classes, making friends, and living arrangements. However, teachers do not see bullying or loneliness as, particularly important problems. Interestingly, the teachers who teach non-medical disciplines considered that it is easier for international students to cope with various difficulties. It is a possibility that these teachers have fewer interactions with the students and thus become less aware of their problems.

Most teachers consider that an important challenge in working with international students is the teaching process. They consider that some students are less interested in the courses, that they have a few hours to deliver the information and that making the students interested in their course is sometimes difficult. The language barrier, cultural differences, and the student's behaviors might also act as important barriers. However, most of these challenges are also encountered by the students, who might have problems with the language or with their adaptation to the host culture. Bureaucracy is also seen as an important problem for students.

To cope with these difficulties, the teachers encourage the students' opinions, try to create various opportunities for collaborations and group work, and focus on student-centered approaches. The teachers also encourage multi-cultural exchange and extracurricular activities.

The teachers appear to prefer using a student-centered approach in education, rather than a teacher-centered approach. However, both approaches are used by the teachers in different moments. Using a more teacher-oriented approach is related to believing that the students encounter more problems. This correlation might appear because when focusing more on their teaching and less on the students, the teachers might underestimate the progress achieved by the students. Thus, they could consider that some difficulties are more important, despite the fact the student might have the necessary mechanisms to cope with them.

In the end, the teachers consider that working with international students rise some problems, but that they also have the optimal tools to deal with the problems. It is also worth mentioning that most teachers consider that their activity with international students can help them grow. They develop their teaching style, become better people (more flexible and open), they improve their language skills, find out new information and, above all, they develop the cultural and multicultural competencies, learning more about diversity, the benefits of being different and how to work and live in a multicultural environment.