

A Comparison of International Students' Engagement and Faculty Perceptions of International Student Engagement

Rong Wang & Allison BrckaLorenz
Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University Bloomington

Authors' Note

This is a work in progress. Please do not cite without permission from the authors. Please direct any correspondence concerning this paper to Rong Wang (wangrong@indiana.edu). Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Antonio, TX, April 2017.

Abstract

With the exponential growth of international students pursuing degrees at U.S. colleges and universities, an increasing number of faculty and staff have brought up questions and concerns about supporting international students' academic engagement and success. Although prior studies have explored the educational experiences of international students in the U.S., only a small number of them have investigated international student engagement at four-year institutions. Little is known about faculty's approaches to international student engagement and how they may differ from international students' self-reported engagement. Using large-scale and multi-institutional survey datasets, this quantitative study aims to explore international student engagement in learning strategies, collaborative learning, and student-faculty interaction, and to compare international student engagement from the perspectives of faculty and students. Recommendations on supporting international student engagement from an individual faculty level, department level, and institutional level are discussed in the end.

Key words: student engagement, international student perspectives, faculty perspectives, comparative study

A Comparison of International Students' Engagement and Faculty Perceptions of International Student Engagement

Colleges and universities in the U.S. have enrolled a dramatically increasing number of international students pursuing postsecondary degrees, which is an important indicator of globalization and internationalization in higher education in the 21st century. According to the 2016 Open Doors Report, the number of international students at colleges and universities in the U.S. has reached a record high of 1,043,839 in the 2015-16 academic year, which increased 7% from the number in the 2014-15 academic year (974,926) (Institute of International Education, 2016). The Institute of International Education similarly reports that the number of international students in the U.S. has reached a record of over one million for the first time during the 2015-16 academic year (Institute of International Education, 2016). Among the 20 million students enrolled at U.S. colleges and universities, international students represent nearly 5% of the entire postsecondary population in the 2015-16 academic year, which increased nearly 1% from the 2014-15 academic year. Among those international students, 78% were degree seekers. Remarkably, the number of international students has increased by 91% since 2000 (Institute of International Education, 2016). Among the entire international student enrollment at U.S. campuses in the 2015-16 academic year, students from China, India, Saudi Arabia, and South Korea represented 60% of international students (China: 32%; India: 16%; Saudi Arabia: 6%; and South Korea: 6%) (Institute of International Education, 2016). It is worth noting that China, India, and South Korea have ranked in the top three leading places of origin from 2012 to 2015. The proportion of Chinese international students (CISs) has been the highest among the sub-groups of international students enrolled in U.S. higher education since 2006 (Institute of International Education, 2016). The number of Saudi Arabian students in the U.S. surpassed the

number of South Korean students in the 2015-16 academic year and moved up to third in the ranking of top places of origin of international students (Institute of International Education, 2016).

It is important for faculty members and student advisors, who work closely with international students, to understand international students' educational experiences, such as their engagement, in the U.S. There are some studies focused on international students' engagement in the U.S. (Korobova, 2012; Zhao, Kuh, & Carini, 2005), however, little is known about faculty's perceptions of and contribution to international student engagement and no studies have compared international student engagement from the perspectives of students and faculty. Faculty and staff have limited resources and practices to refer to when supporting international students. This study is significant in helping international students and faculty establish mutual understandings about performance and expectations of student engagement. Faculty and staff can utilize the findings to understand international student engagement and create effective practices to support international student engagement cross-culturally.

This paper begins with reviewing scholarly literature about internationalization and student engagement in U.S. higher education. Specifically, literature about students' effective learning strategies, collaborative learning, and student-faculty interactions will be discussed. Then the measures, data sources, respondent profiles, and analyses used in this study will be detailed in the methods section. Limitations of this study will also be addressed. After examining the findings, discussion and implications regarding effective practices in supporting faculty and staff to engage international students will be offered.

Literature Review

Internationalization in U.S. Higher Education

Montgomery (2010) claimed that “internationalization is part of the contextual background to the spread of international students in higher education across the globe” (p.3). Internationalization in higher education has been an explicit phenomenon in U.S. higher education in the 21st century. The features of an internationalized campus can be seen from various perspectives, such as internationalized curricula; a growing number of international students, scholars, and faculty members; and frequent communication and exchanges with overseas institutions. With an increasingly frequent transnational mobility of international students coming to study in the U.S., international students play an active role in enhancing the internationalization and globalization of U.S. higher education (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

International students are considered to be one of the most diverse groups on U.S. college and university campuses, not only because they represent over 220 countries and regions in the world (Institute of International Education, 2016), but also because of their racial and ethnic identification, nationality, language, socioeconomic status, religious and cultural background, and political views (Hanassab, 2006; Spencer-Rodgers, 2001). Beyond contributing over 30.5 billion dollars to the U.S. economy, international students also contribute international perspectives through academic interactions with faculty members and peers, and enhance their departments' academic reputations, rankings, and global connections (Andrade, 2006; Eland & Thomas, 2013; Institute of International Education, 2016; Lee, 2014). International students also help domestic students who may not have opportunities to study abroad by enriching learning experiences and developing abilities in interacting with diverse others (Andrade, 2006; Trice, 2003; McMurtrie, 2011). Thus, international student engagement is closely relevant to the academic success of U.S. domestic students. Additionally, international students are an important component of the entire student body. International student engagement is closely related to their

retention and success. Therefore, it is important for institutions to care and support their international students. The next section discusses an important factor that influences student academic success—student engagement.

Student Engagement

Student engagement measures the time and effort students spend on participating in academic and co-curricular activities (Kuh, 2003). Students tend to gain more from their collegiate experiences when they devote more time and energy to educationally purposeful activities, such as frequently interacting with diverse others and applying what they learn to solve real-world problems (Kuh, 2003). The following paragraphs will discuss college student engagement in the U.S. and specifically, international student engagement in the U.S.

College Student Engagement in the U.S. Student engagement varies greatly among students with different backgrounds. A number of prior studies have examined the engagement of U.S. students (e.g. Kuh, 2001, 2003; Kuh & Hu, 2001; Kuh et al, 2006; Kuh et al, 2010; Quaye & Harper, 2014). The engagement of students with diverse or nontraditional backgrounds and experiences has been widely studied, focusing on demographics such as gender identity, racial and ethnic identification, major fields, enrollment status, first-generation status, age, and grade point average (GPA) (e.g. Bridges, Carini, Hayek, & Harper, 2004; Carini, Kuh, & Klein, 2006; Denson, & Chang, 2009; Junco, 2012; Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie, & Gonyea, 2008; Pike & Kuh, 2005). Taking the engagement of first generation college students as an example, Pike and Kuh (2005) surveyed 3,000 undergraduate students in the U.S. and compared the engagement and intellectual development of first-generation and second-generation college students. They found that compared to the engagement of students who had at least one parent who graduated from college, first generation students were generally less engaged in college life, insufficiently

integrated into diverse college experiences, and perceived their college environment as less supportive (Pike & Kuh, 2005). Among the literature addressing the educational experiences of international students in the U.S., only a few studies have specifically explored the engagement of international students (Korobova, 2012; Lee, 2014; Ross & Chen, 2015; Urban & Bierlein Palmer, 2014; Zhao, Kuh, & Carini, 2005).

International Student Engagement in the U.S. Compared with U.S. students, international student engagement levels differed by class standing and by different areas of engagement. Zhao, Kuh, and Carini (2005) compared the engagement in academic activities between international students and U.S. students in the U.S. context. They found that compared to U.S. students, international students were more engaged in the areas of academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and using technology in course activities. Additionally, international students also perceived greater gains in personal and social development and general education outcomes than their U.S. peers. Nonetheless, international students were less engaged in community service and socializing than their U.S. peers (Zhao, Kuh, & Carini, 2005). Korobova's (2012) found that international students had higher scores in enriching educational experiences and supportive campus environment than U.S. students in their senior year.

Zhao, Kuh, and Carini (2005) also looked into the variation of international student engagement by their racial and ethnic identification. Although the data Zhao, Kuh, and Carini (2005) used did not allow them to identify international students' countries of origin, they used racial and ethnic identification as the proxy for international students' countries of origin and cultural norms. Thus, Zhao, Kuh, and Carini (2005) categorized international students into Asian, White, and Black. They found that Asian international students reported fewer gains in general education and had lower satisfaction with their educational experiences than their Black

international peers had. Additionally, Black international students surpassed their White peers in several engagement areas, such as academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student interactions with faculty, and service learning in the senior year (Zhao, Kuh, & Carini, 2005).

This study will focus on international undergraduate students' engagement in learning strategies, collaborative learning, and student faculty interaction, all of which are closely related to student learning outcomes.

Effective Learning Strategies

Learning strategies (LS) enable learners to make the best use of their strengths as well as monitor their time, concentration, effort, and comprehension (McKeachie, Pintrich, & Lin, 1985; Riding & Sadler-Smith, 1997). Ormord (2011) claimed that a variety of strategies can be used by students to enhance learning, which ranged from taking notes in class to summarizing information and creating a conducive learning environment. With effective learning strategies, learners are more likely to have a better understanding about an emphasis on mastery or performance goal in class (Ames & Archer, 1988).

Scholars studied the learning challenges and learning strategies that international college students have encountered in English-speaking countries and how the learning strategies differ between international students and domestic students. Because very few studies have investigated the learning strategies used by international students in the U.S., we present a study conducted in Australia as an example. Ramsay, Barker, and Jones (1999) investigated the academic adjustment and learning process of 20 international freshmen at an Australian university. They found that those non-Australian students had difficulties in understanding lectures because of their vocabulary or the speed of the lecture. Although international students believed that they benefited a lot from tutoring, they still felt challenged when tutors spoke too

fast or gave limited input (Ramsay, Barker, & Jones, 1999). In addition, Ramsay et al. (1999) also observed a number of differences in learning preferences between non-Australian students and local Australian students. For example, in terms of the significant elements for learning, non-Australian students believed that critical thinking skills and faculty members' feedback on writing skills were essential for learning, whereas local Australian students expressed that collaborative learning and peer support were salient to learning. Different perceptions of essential learning skills can lead to different expectations for the support provided by faculty members. Therefore, it is important for faculty members and student advisors to clearly understand the challenges students have encountered in learning and the current strategies students are employing.

Collaborative Learning

Collaborative learning (CL) requires students to interact with peers, which has been shown to have a positive relationship with student gains and satisfaction with college (Astin, 1993). Many scholars have noted that international students do not actively collaborate with U.S. students in learning (e.g. Lee & Rice, 2007; Yuan, 2011). Based on a qualitative study with 24 international students from over 15 countries, Lee and Rice (2007) asserted that worrying about English proficiency, international students who studied in the U.S. often felt uncomfortable participating in group-work or interacting with peer classmates. That is why many international students prefer collaborating only with peers from the same country or those who share similar cultural backgrounds (Sarkodie-Mensah, 1998).

Student-Faculty Interaction

Several studies have examined the impact of student-faculty interaction (SF) on student development and learning outcomes (Kuh & Hu, 2001; Kuh et al, 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini,

1980; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005). Kezar and Moriarty (2000) found that SF is positively associated with a wide range of student outcomes, such as students' self-assessed leadership abilities and social self-confidence. Faculty members play an essential role in influencing student learning both in and out of the classroom (Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005). Through interviews with two international students enrolled in the U.S., Tseng and Newton (2002) found the relationship between international students and their instructors and advisors was important to international students' learning. Additionally, a good relationship effectively helped international students achieve their goals and promote professional development (Tseng & Newton, 2002). Umbach and Wawrzynski (2005) advocated that if faculty members employed collaborative teaching and learning methods, and if they tended to value the behavior of respecting students and challenging them academically, students were more likely to have higher levels of engagement and learning outcomes. Chickering (1969) argued that students' sense of purpose would be enhanced as the frequency of SF increased, regardless of whether the interaction was formal or informal. The literature above all supports the important role of faculty members in enhancing students' academic achievement and supporting their success.

Several scholars examined the beneficial effects of SF among students with diverse backgrounds. Lundberg and Schreiner (2004) investigated the relationship between SF and student learning. They found that compared to students' background characteristics, students' relationships with faculty members act as strong predictors of learning. Those predictors were strongest for students of color (Lundberg & Schreiner, 2004). In addition, Anaya and Cole (2001) examined the impact of SF on college students' academic achievement among Latina/o students, and found that SF, both academic interactions and personal interactions, and students' perceived quality of relationships with faculty members were positively associated with Latina/o students'

college grades. Sax, Bryant, and Harper (2005) compared the different effects of SF between college men and women from several perspectives, such as gender differences in frequencies of interacting with faculty members and the impact of involvement with faculty members. One of the interesting findings was that female students reported more frequent and more positive interactions with faculty members than their male counterparts did in general. However, male students reported more frequent SF than female students in the following aspects: talking about better grades with faculty members outside of class, stronger interests in science and arts, as well as a higher-level sense of competitiveness (Sax, Bryant, & Harper, 2005). Kezar and Moriarty (2000) also claimed that SF had a positive association with self-rated public speaking ability of male students and perceptions of capacity to influence others for female students.

Not all studies support the positive effects of SF on all students. Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) claimed that pure social exchange between students and faculty members does not affect students' learning outcomes unless they involve intellectual or substantial interactions. More to the point, Endo and Harpel (1982) found that SF, regardless of formal or informal, did not have significant impact on students' academic achievement as measured by college GPA. Kuh (2003) also discussed the appropriate amount of interactions with faculty members being considered as enough interactions. He highlighted that more interactions may not necessarily equal better interactions between students and faculty members (Kuh, 2003). The essential and substantial factor of the quality of interactions relies on the nature and frequencies of the contact (Kuh, 2003). In other words, SF will not matter most to student learning unless "it encourages students to devote greater effort to other educationally purposeful activities during college" (Kuh, 2003, p. 29).

Engaging International Students

Several studies have examined faculty experiences in engaging international students, and have recommended strategies to faculty for supporting international students (Carroll & Ryan, 2005; Groccia, Alsudairi & Buskist, 2012; Lee, 2014). Having conducted a qualitative study in the U.S., Trice (2003) found that some faculty observed a significant difference in language obstacles and culture adjustment between international and domestic graduate students from the U.S., whereas other faculty observed few differences. Carlin (2010) discussed internationalizing faculty's scholarly experiences and suggested including more international content and issues in the course. Dunn and Carroll (2005) advocated the necessity of informal faculty learning communities for teaching international students. For example, Carlin (2010) discussed internationalizing faculty members' scholarly experiences and suggested including more international content and issues in the curricular design. Interviewed about faculty member's attitudes and approaches toward graduate international students in the U.S., Trice (2003) found that some faculty members observed a significant difference in language obstacles and culture adjustment between international and graduate students from the U.S., whereas some other faculty members observed few differences. Although this study focused on the engagement of undergraduate international students, we believe that there are common themes in faculty members' approaches to international student engagement on a group level, regardless of students' class standings.

Scholars have also discussed different opinions on whether to use social learning groups among international students (Gillett & Baskerville, 2010; McFadden, 2014). Tinto (2003) advocated that by creating an environment of learning groups among adult learners that everyone served as learning resources for each other. However, Gillett and Baskerville (2010) argued that Tinto's social learning approach was not applicable among Asian adult learners. Using a mixed

method study to examine the learning preferences of 273 undergraduate students majoring in accounting in the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand, Gillett and Baskerville (2010) found that social group learning was not valued among some international students. McFadden (2014) brought up the question of whether international students' dislike of social group learning should be respected as a cultural influence or should faculty encourage international students to interact with native English speakers. Such questions have led to ongoing debates among scholars and practitioners in the field of higher education.

Helping international students understand culture in the United States will contribute to promoting international student engagement and enhancing their learning (Yuan, 2011). Yuan (2011) interviewed a faculty member who taught Chinese students at an U.S. university. She found that understanding culture in the U.S. helped students develop a sense of belonging in class, which helped students "to participate more, engage more, and learn more" (Yuan, 2011, p.148). Additionally, making international students understand the culture of a U.S. college classroom also helped them clarify the expectations of their professors. For example, students are expected to express their thoughts and propose questions freely, and being quiet in class can be considered as incompetent and inattentive in the U.S. (Yuan, 2011), whereas it would be perceived as a sign of good self-discipline and respecting teachers in Asian countries, like China. Yuan's (2011) findings are applicable to a large group of international students from non-English speaking countries who are studying in the U.S. Therefore, it is very necessary and important that faculty members and staff assist international students in understanding the culture in U.S. society and academic life.

Gaps in the Literature

Several gaps exist in the literature presented here. First, among the current literature

about international students' educational experiences and learning preferences, more studies are needed about international students' learning preferences and engagement in the U.S. context. Higher education in the U.S. has its own unique characteristics, such as a highly diverse student body and the U.S. culture embedded in the campus environment. Second, among the scholarly literature focused on international student experiences in the U.S., many studies examined their adjustment, acculturation, language barriers, or financial burden (e.g. Banjong, 2015; Ladd & Ruby, 1999; Lee & Rice, 2007; Rajapaksa & Dundes, 2002; Valdez, 2015), but little is known about international student engagement in the U.S. context. More and more scholars and practitioners in the U.S. realize the significance of supporting international student engagement, but have limited resources. Third, among the available studies that examined international student engagement in the U.S., only a small number have employed quantitative approaches (Korobova, 2012; Zhao, Kuh, & Carini, 2005). Fourth, prior studies have examined faculty's experiences and opinions on international students' learning (Trice, 2003; Yuan, 2011), but the literature has been neglected in the extent to which and how faculty are engaging international students in the U.S., especially in LS, CL, and SF. No prior studies have paralleled faculty's behaviors in engaging international students with international students' self-reported engagement.

Research Questions

1. How do faculty teaching practices for international students vary by faculty and course characteristics?
2. To what extent are students engaged at institutions where faculty more frequently engage international students?
3. To what extent are international students engaged at institutions where faculty more

frequently engage international students?

Methods

Data Source

The data source for this study comes from the 2016 administrations of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). NSSE asks students how often they engage in various effective educational practices, their perceptions of their college environment, and how they spend their time in and out of the classroom. In 2016, NSSE was administered to 322,582 first-year and senior students at 564 four-year colleges and universities. Complementing NSSE, FSSE focuses on the nature and frequency of student faculty interaction, faculty emphasis on educational practices that are empirically linked with student learning and development, faculty values for institutional support and high-impact practice participation, and how faculty organize their time both in and out of the classroom. In FSSE 2016, over 14,500 faculty responded from 119 bachelor's-granting colleges and universities. A brief item set focusing on faculty perceptions of and contributions to the engagement of international students was appended to FSSE at 14 institutions, yielding 844 faculty responses. The complete wording of items examined from this Teaching International Students (TIS) experimental item set can be found in Table 1.

<<INSERT TABLE 1 HERE>>

Description of Respondents

Eight hundred and forty-four faculty responded to the FSSE 2016 TIS experimental items (Table 1). The largest proportions of these faculty had faculty appointments in Arts and Humanities (21%); Physical Sciences, Mathematics, & Computer Sciences (14%); and Business

(13%). Around a quarter of faculty (27%) were full Professors, with smaller proportions being Associate Professors (20%), Assistant Professors (22%), full-time Lecturers/Instructors (22%), and part-time Lecturers/Instructors (10%). Slightly over half (51%) identified as men, and two in five (41%) identified as women. Nearly three-quarters (70%) identified as White, with smaller proportions identifying as Asian, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander (6%); Black or African American (5%); Hispanic or Latino (3%); or American Indian, Alaska Native, other, or multiracial (5%). Around two in five (43%) faculty selected a lower-division course to respond to questions about with half (50%) of faculty selecting an upper-division course. Most (84%) selected a course taught in a traditional classroom format on campus. For more faculty respondent details see Table 2.

<<INSERT TABLE 2 HERE>>

The student respondents in this study consisted of the 5,682 first-years and seniors at the 14 institutions where faculty responded to the TIS experimental item set. Around 4% (n=188) of these students were international students. The largest proportions of students overall were in Business (23%); Health Professions (16%); and Biological Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Resources (10%) majors. Around two-thirds of students (64%) aspired to a graduate degree. The largest proportions of students were White (69%) or Black or African American (10%). Nearly half of students (45%) lived on campus or were considered first-generation students (47%). Around 61% of students identified as women, and 49% of respondents have earned mostly A grades. Most students (80%) were of traditional age, 23 or younger. More student-respondent details by class level and international student status can be found in Table 3.

<<INSERT TABLE 3 HERE>>

Measures

From FSSE, a selection of questions from the FSSE core survey, including demographics and course characteristics in addition to the items in the TIS experimental item set were included in this study. The demographic items examined included faculty's disciplinary appointment, academic rank, gender identity, citizenship status, and racial/ethnic identification. The course characteristics examined here included course division (upper and lower division) and course format (teaching in a traditional classroom on campus versus formats such as distance education). The items from the TIS experimental item set focused on the frequency of faculty interactions with international students outside of courses (where frequency is measured in the vague quantifiers very often, often, sometimes, or never) and how much faculty encouraged international students to use effective learning strategies and collaborate with their peers (very much, quite a bit, some, very little). Thus, three scales were created by averaging a group of items that measure the same construct based on exploratory factor analysis: Student-Faculty Interaction (TIS_SF, Cronbach's $\alpha = .868$), Learning Strategies (TIS_LS, Cronbach's $\alpha = .866$), and Collaborative Learning (TIS_CL, Cronbach's $\alpha = .892$). See more details about the three scales in Table 1.

From NSSE, student demographics included in this study are citizenship status, major field, educational aspirations, racial/ethnic identification, living situation, transfer status, first-year or senior class, first generation status, gender identity, estimated grade point average, and age. Additional measures on NSSE parallel those on the FSSE TIS item set, asking students how often they interact with their faculty outside of courses (Student-Faculty Interaction, SF), how much they collaborate with peers (Collaborative Learning, CL), and how much they use effective learning strategies (Learning Strategies, LS). Information about these NSSE measures, three of NSSE's ten Engagement Indicators, can be found on the NSSE website nsse.indiana.edu.

Analysis

To answer the first research question (RQ) about how faculty teaching practices for international students vary by faculty and course characteristics, a series of Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression equations were examined. The dependent variables were the TIS scales. The independent variables included were disciplinary area (entered as a STEM versus non-STEM field), gender identity, citizenship, racial/ethnic identification, course format, course division, and academic rank.

To answer the second RQ about the extent to which students are engaged at institutions where faculty more frequently engage international students, another series of OLS regression equations were examined. The FSSE TIS measures were aggregated to the institution level and entered into student regression models as an independent variable acting as an institution-level measure of faculty support for international students. The dependent variable in these models were the NSSE Engagement Indicators listed above, SF, CL, and LS. Other independent variables used as controls were student major, degree aspirations, racial/ethnic identification, living situation, transfer status, class level, first-generation status, gender identity, estimated grades, and age.

To answer the third RQ about the extent to which international students are engaged at institutions where faculty more frequently engage international students, a series of similar models were run as those in the second RQ with the exception that the students examined were limited to international students.

Limitations

Several limitations exist for this study. Institutions elect to participate in NSSE and FSSE, they are not randomly selected from institutions in the U.S. and Canada. Additionally,

institutions that elect to participate in FSSE are able to select their own participation sample, so results may not be generalizable to all faculty in all types of institutions. The experimental item set which serves as the focus for this study was only administered to a small selection of institutions participating in FSSE, and institutions were allowed to elect not to have their faculty respond to this item set. Additionally, experimental item sets are administered at the end of the FSSE survey, which may result in the loss of some participants due to the length of the entire survey. Also, faculty are asked to select one course they are teaching during the current school year to respond to most FSSE survey items. It is possible that these results are therefore not generalizable to all courses. Finally, although faculty and students are matched at the institution-level in this study, there is not a direct connection between students and faculty in particular courses. Results from this study should be considered valid for a selection of institutions, students, faculty, and courses and any attempts to generalize this information should be made with caution.

Results

How Do Faculty Teaching Practices for International Students Vary by Faculty and Course Characteristics?

Very few faculty characteristics predicted faculty engagement of international students. Although faculty in STEM fields encouraged international students to collaborate with their peers more than faculty in non-STEM fields ($B = 3.455, p < .05$), the remaining predictors of engagement of international students revolved around faculty members' racial/ethnic identification. Asian and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander faculty ($B = 11.907, p < .001$) and Black or African American faculty ($B = 13.289, p < .001$) participated in more student-faculty interaction with international students. These same faculty encouraged more collaborative

learning (Asian: $B = 8.873, p < .01$; Black: $B = 9.881, p < .01$) and learning strategies (Asian: $B = 13.880, p < .001$; Black: $B = 9.639, p < .01$) for international students than their White colleagues. Hispanic or Latino faculty ($B = 9.221, p < .05$) and faculty who prefer not to respond about their racial/ethnic identification ($B = 5.964, p < .05$) interacted more with international students outside of courses. See Table 4 for more details.

<<INSERT TABLE 4 HERE>>

To What Extent Are Students Engaged at Institutions Where Faculty More Actively Engage International Students in the Classroom?

At institutions where faculty more frequently engaged with international students outside the classroom, all students benefited from higher levels of Student-Faculty Interaction ($B=.318, p < .001$). Similarly, at institutions where faculty more frequently encouraged international students to use effective Learning Strategies, all students benefited from an increase in such engagement ($B=.461, p < .001$). Adversely, at institutions where faculty more frequently encouraged international students to collaborate with their peers, there was not a significant or notable increase in students' Collaborative Learning. See Table 5 for details.

<<INSERT TABLE 5 HERE>>

To What Extent Are International Students Engaged at Institutions Where Faculty More Actively Engage International Students in the Classroom?

At institutions where faculty more frequently engaged with international students outside of the classroom, international students benefited from higher levels of Student-Faculty Interaction ($B=.675, p < .05$). Unfortunately, at institutions where faculty more frequently encouraged international students to use effective learning strategies and to collaborate with their peers, there was not a significant or notable increase in international students' Learning

Strategies and Collaborative Learning scores. See Table 5 for more details.

Discussion

Our findings confirm the significance of faculty support in engaging international students. At institutions where faculty more frequently engage with international students, not only do international students, but all students benefit, especially in student-faculty interaction. Lee (2014) indicated that some international students were often mistaken for U.S. students of color. Thus, they were often marginalized, discriminated, and invisible on campus. Cress (2008) found that students of color, women, and gay/lesbian students were more likely to perceive isolation and discrimination inside and out of their classroom. However, a strong student-faculty relationship mitigated the unwelcoming and negative campus climate. This study affirms Cress's (2008) study that a strong student-faculty interaction will contribute to enhancing international students' sense of belonging and promoting an inclusive learning environment not only for international, but all students. Cress (2008) believed "if students are respected as individuals, rather than "treated like numbers," students' connections with faculty will be enhanced and ultimately so will their educational development" (p.108).

This study will not only add a helpful piece to current literature regarding international students' engagement in the U.S. at four-year institutions, but also has practical value for faculty members, student advisors, international educators, and international students themselves. This study parallels international students' engagement with faculty member's behaviors in engaging international students, which will help international students and faculty members to establish mutual understanding about student engagement. Additionally, faculty members and student advisors can utilize the findings of this study to understand international students' engagement in LS, CL, and SF and create effective practices to support international students' engagement

cross-culturally as well as provide the sufficient resources they need.

Furthermore, this study will add an important piece to the global studies literature regarding international students' educational experiences in U.S. higher education. The findings and implications of this study may be generalized and transferrable to study international students' engagement in countries and regions with similar educational contexts and teaching practices that face similar questions about enrolling a growing number of international students and supporting international students' engagement. Although there might be cultural differences among those countries or regions, this study will create fundamental conversations among scholars and practitioners on supporting international students in different countries, and may facilitate cross-national collaborations in helping international students' success in higher education.

Implications

In order to encourage more faculty in engaging international students, institutions and departments should provide sufficient resources for faculty to achieve such goals. As it is shown in our findings, faculty of color, such as Asian faculty, Black or African American faculty, and Hispanic or Latino faculty engaged their international students more actively. We recommend that institutions and departments include faculty support for international students in evaluation or consider supporting international students as an essential criterion in promotion.

New faculty orientations, faculty learning communities, faculty reading groups, and teaching workshops are all great opportunities to bring faculty together to exchange ideas and concerns about engaging international students, understanding the significance of engaging international students in courses, and learning about strategies in creating an engaging and inclusive classroom environment for all students. Some effective strategies that faculty can apply

to create an inclusive classroom environment are role playing, small group activities, and team projects. Our findings indicated that at institutions where faculty more frequently encouraged international students in collaborative learning, there was not a notable increase in either overall students' collaborative learning or international students' collaborative learning. We strongly recommend faculty re-examine the strategies they employ to encourage students to learn collaboratively. Encouragement may not be enough so instructors may want to consider requiring some amount of collaboration amongst students. We recommend that faculty consider using instructor-assigned teams instead of students' self-selected groups to avoid several disadvantages of student self-selected groups. With student self-selected groups, students with strong abilities or pre-existing friendships are more likely to team up together; under-represented minorities, such as women students in STEM fields, will be potentially isolated (Deibel, 2005). In student self-selected groups, international students may also be more likely to choose to work with other international students. We additionally recommend that faculty use peer evaluations in collaborative learning activities to encourage the team to hold each other accountable.

Additionally, institutions and departments could also initiate programs that bring faculty and student affairs professionals together to support international students. Several institutions have living-learning communities with global or international themes, such as the Global Village in the International Living Learning Center at Oregon State University and the Global Village Living-Learning Center at Indiana University Bloomington (Indiana University, 2017). With supportive faculty and staff, those living learning communities provide a friendly platform for international and domestic students who have strong interests in cultural exchange and global experiences.

The variation in LS, CL, and SF within international student subgroups is another

important consideration in future studies of international students. Due to the limited sample for international students from specific countries and regions in this study, we were not able to break down international students into subgroups for analysis. Future studies could add a qualitative approach, such as focus groups or semi-structured interviews, to explore more information about the variation in engagement among international students from different countries and regions.

In conclusion, international students are an important component of the student population in U.S. higher education institutions. Colleges and universities have responsibilities and should make efforts to serve, retain, and graduate them (Byrd, 1991). Faculty approaches and behaviors in connecting with international students will be beneficial to the engagement of international students and students overall, especially in student-faculty interaction. Institutions and departments should provide sufficient resources and support to faculty and staff to engage international students and to create an inclusive and welcoming learning environment for all students.

References

- 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.
- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of educational psychology*, 80(3), 260.
- Anaya, G., & Cole, D. G. (2001). Latina/o student achievement: Exploring the influence of student-faculty interactions on college grades. *Journal of college student development*, 42(1), 3-14.
- Andrade, M.S. (2006). International students in English-speaking universities: Adjustment factors. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 5, 131-154.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banjong, D. N. (2015). International students' enhanced academic performance: Effects of campus resources. *Journal of International Students*, 5(2), 132-142.
- Bridges, B. K., Carini, R. M., Hayek, J. C., & Harper, S. R. (2004). Gender differences in student engagement among African American undergraduates at historically Black colleges and universities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(3), 271-284.
- Carini, R. M., Kuh, G. D., & Klein, S. P. (2006). Student engagement and student learning: Testing the linkages*. *Research in higher education*, 47(1), 1-32.
- Carlin, D. B (2010). Internationalizing the scholarly experience of faculty. In D.B. Johnstone, M. B. d'Ambrosio, & P. J. Yakoboski (Eds.) *Higher education in a global society*. (pp.148-161). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Carroll, J. & Ryan, J. (2005) *Teaching international students. Improving learning for all*. New

- York, NY, Routledge.
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. Jossey-Bass.
- Cress, C. M. (2008). Creating inclusive learning communities: the role of student–faculty relationships in mitigating negative campus climate. *Learning Inquiry*, 2(2), 95-111.
- Deibel, K. (2005). Team Formation Methods for Increasing Interaction During In-Class Group Work. Retrieved from: <http://faculty.washington.edu/deibel/papers/iticse05-groupwork/deibel-iticse05-groupwork.pdf>
- Denson, N., & Chang, M. J. (2009). Racial diversity matters: The impact of diversity-related student engagement and institutional context. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(2), 322-353.
- Dunn, L. & Carroll, J. (2005). Collaborating and co-learning: Sharing the message on teaching international students within institutions. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Ed.) *Teaching International Students: Improving learning for all*. (pp. 136-146). New York, NY, Routledge.
- Eland, A., & Thomas, K. (2013). Succeeding Abroad: International Students in the United States. In H.C. Alberts & H.D. Hazen (Ed.), *International students and scholars in the United States: Coming from abroad*. (pp. 145-162). New York, NY, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Endo, J. J., & Harpel, R. L. (1982). The effect of student-faculty interaction on students' educational outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 16(2), 115-138.
- Gillett, S. A., & Baskerville, R. (2012). Student Learning Preferences: International Students in Comparative Perspective. *International Journal of Learning*, 18(11).
- Groccia, J. E., Alsudairi, M. A., & Buskist, W. (Eds.) (2012). *Handbook of college and university teaching: A global perspective*. Sage.

- Hanassab, S. (2006). Diversity, international students, and perceived discrimination: Implications for educators and counselors. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(2), 157-172.
- Indiana University (2017). Indiana University Global Living-Learning Community. <http://globalvillage.indiana.edu/home/>
- Institute of International Education. (2016). *Open Doors Data. Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data#.WDtFZ9IrLIW>
- Junco, R. (2012). The relationship between frequency of Facebook use, participation in Facebook activities, and student engagement. *Computers & Education*, 58(1), 162-171.
- Kezar, A., & Moriarty, D. (2000). Expanding our understanding of student leadership development: A study exploring gender and ethnic identity. *Journal of College Student Development*.
- Korobova, N. (2012). A comparative study of student engagement, satisfaction, and academic success among international and American students. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3374&context=etd>
- Kuh, G. D. (2001). The National Survey of Student Engagement: Conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties. *Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research*, 1-26.
- Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE: Benchmarks for effective educational practices. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 35(2), 24-32.
- Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *The Journal of Higher*

Education, 79(5), 540-563.

Kuh, G. D., & Hu, S. (2001). The effects of student-faculty interaction in the 1990s. *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(3), 309-332.

Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J., Bridges, B., & Hayek, J. (2006). What Matters to Student Success: A Review of the Literature Commissioned Report for the National Symposium on Postsecondary Student Success: Spearheading a Dialog on Student Success. National Postsecondary Education Cooperative. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/npec/pdf/kuh_team_report.pdf

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2010). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. John Wiley & Sons.

Ladd, P. D., & Ruby Jr, R. (1999). Learning style and adjustment issues of international students. *Journal of Education for Business*, 74(6), 363-367.

Lee, J. J. (2014). Engaging International Students. In S. J. Quaye and S. R. Harper (Ed.), *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations*, Second Edition (pp. 105-120). Routledge.

Lee, J. J., & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of discrimination. *Higher Education*, 53(3), 381-409.

Lundberg, C. A., & Schreiner, L. A. (2004). Quality and frequency of faculty-student interaction as predictors of learning: An analysis by student race/ethnicity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(5), 549-565.

McFadden, C. (2014). Best Practices for Teaching International Students. *Journal of Modern Education Review*, 737.

McKeachie, W. J., Pintrich, P. R., & Lin, Y. (1985). Teaching learning strategies. *Educational*

Psychologist, 20, 153-160.

McMurtrie, B. (2011). International Enrollments at U.S. Colleges Grow but Still Rely on China.

Chronicle Of Higher Education, 58(13), A16-12.

Montgomery, C. (2010). *Understanding the international student experience*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Oregon State University (2017). Global Village Living-Learning Community.

<http://uhds.oregonstate.edu/globalvillage>

Ormrod, J.E. (2011). *Human learning* (6th ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty-years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pike, G. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2005). First-and second-generation college students: A comparison of their engagement and intellectual development. *Journal of Higher Education*, 276-300.

Quaye, S. J., & Harper, S. R. (2014). *Student engagement in higher education: Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations*. Routledge.

Rajapaksa, S., & Dundes, L. (2002). It's a long way home: International student adjustment to living in the United States. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice*, 4(1), 15-28.

Ramsay, S., Barker, M., & Jones, E. (1999). Academic Adjustment and Learning Processes: a comparison of international and local students in first-year university. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 18(1), 129-144.

Riding, R. J., & Sadler-Smith, E. (1997). Cognitive style and learning strategies: Some implications for training design. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 1(3), 199-208.

- Ross, H., & Chen, Y. (2015). Engaging Chinese International Undergraduate Students in the American University. *Learning And Teaching: The International Journal Of Higher Education In The Social Sciences*, 8(3), 13-36.
- Sarkodie-Mensah, K. (1998). International Students in the US: Trends, Cultural Adjustments, and Solutions for a Better Experience. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 39(3), 214-222.
- Sax, L. J., Bryant, A. N., & Harper, C. E. (2005). The differential effects of student-faculty interaction on college outcomes for women and men. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(6), 642-657.
- Spencer-Rodgers, J. (2001). Consensual and individual stereotypic beliefs about international students among American host nationals. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25(6), 639-657.
- Tinto, V. (2003). Learning better together: The impact of learning communities on student success. *Higher Education monograph series*, 1(8).
- Trice, A. G. (2003). Faculty perceptions of graduate international students: The benefits and challenges. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(4), 379-403.
- Tseng, W., & Newton, F. B. (2002). International Students' Strategies for Well-Being. *College Student Journal*, 36(4), 591-597.
- Umbach, P. D. & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(2), 153-184.
- Urban, E. L., & Bierlein Palmer, L. (2014). International students as a resource for internationalization of higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18(4), 305-324.

- Valdez, G. (2015). US higher education classroom experiences of undergraduate Chinese international students. *Journal of International Students*, 5(2), 188-200.
- Yuan, W. (2011). Academic and cultural experiences of Chinese students at an American university: A qualitative study. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 141-157.
- Zhao, C. M., Kuh, G. D., & Carini, R. M. (2005). A comparison of international student and American student engagement in effective educational practices. *Journal of Higher Education*, 209-231.

Table 1. Select Teaching International Students Experimental Items and Scale Information

Select Items:	Scale information:
Earlier, you answered some questions based on one particular undergraduate course section that you are teaching or have taught during this academic year. Thinking again about that course, please respond to the following items.	
2. During the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following with <i>international students</i> you teach or advise? <i>Response options: Very often, Often, Sometimes, Never</i>	These items make up the TIS_SF scale.
a. Talked about their career plans	Min: 0
b. Worked on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	Max: 60
c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts outside of class	Mean: 28.51
d. Discussed their academic performance	SD: 15.96
	α : .868
5. In your selected course section, how much do you encourage <i>international students</i> to do the following? <i>Response options: Very much, Quite a bit, Some, Very little</i>	These items make up the TIS_CL scale.
a. Ask other students for help understanding course material	Min: 0
b. Explain course material to other students	Max: 60
c. Prepare for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	Mean: 31.72
d. Work with other students on course projects or assignments	SD: 18.29
	α : .892
e. Identify key information from reading assignments	These items make up the TIS_LS scale.
f. Review notes after class	Min: 0
g. Summarize what has been learned from class or from course materials	Max: 60
	Mean: 35.20
	SD: 18.20
	α : .866

Table 2. Select Faculty and Course Characteristics (N=844)

		Percentage (%)
Disciplinary area	Arts & Humanities	21.1
	Biological Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Resources	7.6
	Physical Sciences, Mathematics, & Computer Sciences	13.7
	Social Sciences	12.5
	Business	13.3
	Communications, Media, & Public Relations	3.1
	Education	4.7
	Engineering	6.1
	Health Professions	8.1
	Social Service Professions	1.9
STEM field	Other disciplines	7.8
	No	71.6
Academic rank	Yes	28.4
	Full Professor	26.6
	Associate Professor	19.9
	Assistant Professor	21.8
	Full-time Lecturer/Instructor	21.6
Gender identity	Part-time Lecturer/Instructor	10.1
	Man	51.0
	Woman	41.0
U.S. citizen	I prefer not to respond	8.0
	No	3.5
Racial/ethnic identification	Yes	96.5
	Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Other Pacific Islander	5.9
	Black or African American	5.2
	Hispanic or Latino	3.2
	White	69.9
	American Indian, Alaska Native, Other, Multiracial	4.8
Course division	I prefer not to respond	11.0
	Lower division	43.2
	Upper division	50.1
Course format	Other	6.7
	Classroom instruction on-campus	84.0
	Other course format (classroom at an auxiliary location, distance education, or combination of classroom instruction and distance education)	16.1

Table 3. Select Student Characteristics by International Student (IS) Status and Class

		First-Year (%)		Senior (%)		Total (%)	
		Non-IS	IS	Non-IS	IS	Non-IS	IS
Major field	Arts & Humanities	5.3	1.1	5.6	3.3	5.5	2.2
	Biological Sciences, Agriculture, & Natural Resources	9.5	6.5	10.2	5.6	9.9	6.0
	Physical Sciences, Mathematics, & Computer Science	5.6	5.4	3.4	4.4	4.2	4.9
	Social Sciences	7.6	6.5	9.5	12.2	8.8	9.3
	Business	21.8	40.9	21.5	45.6	21.6	43.2
	Communications, Media, & Public Relations	2.0	1.1	2.7	4.4	2.4	2.7
	Education	9.5	6.5	10.1	1.1	9.9	3.8
	Engineering	8.3	17.2	6.6	12.2	7.2	14.8
	Health Professions	15.3	5.4	16.9	6.7	16.3	6.0
	Social Service Professions	6.1	2.2	6.7	< 1	6.5	1.1
	All Other	4.5	2.2	6.5	4.4	5.7	3.3
Undecided, undeclared	4.5	5.4	< 1	< 1	2.0	2.7	
Educational aspirations	Some college/university	5.9	9.6	6.1	4.3	6.0	7.0
	Bachelor's degree	34.8	13.8	28.0	18.5	30.6	16.1
	Master's degree	38.1	54.3	44.2	45.7	41.9	50.0
	Doctoral or professional degree	21.2	22.3	21.7	31.5	21.5	26.9
Racial/ethnic identification	American Indian or Alaska Native	< 1	1.1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
	Asian	3.0	28.7	2.2	24.2	2.5	26.5
	Black or African American	8.4	16.0	10.5	16.5	9.7	16.2
	Hispanic or Latino	7.9	16.0	6.4	15.4	7.0	15.7
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
	White	70.6	20.2	71.8	16.5	71.4	18.4
	Other	< 1	8.5	< 1	13.2	< 1	10.8
	Multiracial	6.4	5.3	4.6	7.7	5.3	6.5
	I prefer not to respond	2.1	4.3	2.8	6.6	2.5	5.4
Living on campus	No	24.2	33.7	74.3	71.4	55.2	52.2
	Yes	75.8	66.3	25.7	28.6	44.8	47.8
First-generation	No	58.3	66.3	49.4	76.1	52.8	71.1
	Yes	41.7	33.7	50.6	23.9	47.2	28.9
Gender identity	Man	38.6	44.8	35.5	56.5	36.7	50.5
	Woman	60.1	51.0	62.8	42.4	61.8	46.8
	Another gender identity	< 1	2.1	< 1	< 1	< 1	1.1
	Prefer not to respond	< 1	2.1	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.6
Grades	Mostly A grades	49.1	45.3	49.1	51.1	49.1	48.1
	Mostly B grades	42.3	51.6	44.0	43.5	43.4	47.6
	Mostly C grades or lower	8.6	3.2	6.8	5.4	7.5	4.3
Age	19 or younger	90.3	65.3	< 1	2.2	34.7	34.4
	20-23	5.4	29.5	68.8	70.3	44.6	49.5
	24-29	1.4	5.3	13.8	22.0	9.1	13.4
	30-39	1.5	< 1	8.7	4.4	6.0	2.2
	40-55	1.4	< 1	6.9	1.1	4.8	< 1
	Over 55	< 1	< 1	1.4	< 1	< 1	< 1

Table 4. OLS Regression Coefficients for FSSE Scales

		Student-Faculty Interaction (TIS_SF)				Collaborative Learning (TIS_CL)				Learning Strategies (TIS_LS)			
		B	SE	β	Sig.	B	SE	β	Sig.	B	SE	β	Sig.
	(Constant)	23.165	5.065		***	35.048	5.203		***	40.006	5.223		***
Disciplinary Area	STEM field	-2.931	1.629	-.081		3.459	1.658	.085	*	-1.292	1.615	-.032	
Gender identity	Woman	.233	1.520	.007		1.349	1.565	.036		1.448	1.528	.039	
<i>Man as reference</i>	Prefer not to respond	.222	3.415	.004		3.050	3.638	.045		1.575	3.507	.023	
Racial/ethnic identification	Asian and Native HI or other PI	12.498	3.130	.196	***	6.828	3.320	.091	*	11.919	3.220	.165	***
<i>White as reference</i>	Black/African American	13.343	3.207	.179	***	9.791	3.343	.115	**	9.718	3.275	.116	**
	Hispanic/Latino	9.401	3.960	.103	*	.646	4.219	.006		.180	4.024	.002	
	American Indian AK Native, Other, or Multiracial	3.077	3.026	.044		-3.00	3.363	-.004		1.100	3.207	.013	
	I prefer not to respond	6.001	2.879	.114	*	.722	3.191	.012		1.387	3.073	.023	
Course format	Classroom format	-.865	1.897	-.020		1.318	2.007	.026		.282	1.935	.006	
Course division	Upper division	1.677	1.515	.051		1.383	1.562	.037		.952	1.516	.026	
<i>Lower as reference</i>	Other	5.103	2.828	.082		-.758	2.935	-.011		-.640	2.869	-.009	
Academic rank	Associate Professor	1.545	2.047	.038		-1.277	2.159	-0.028		-3.176	2.102	-0.071	
<i>Full professor as reference</i>	Assistant Professor	3.747	2.068	.096		0.835	2.181	0.019		1.080	2.133	0.024	
	FT Lecturer/Instructor	1.393	2.082	.035		-2.141	2.163	-0.049		-0.866	2.112	-0.020	
	PT Lecturer/Instructor	-3.011	2.732	-.052		0.116	2.771	0.002		-0.563	2.700	-0.009	
Citizenship	U.S. citizen	1.718	4.256	.020		-7.392	4.447	-0.073		-6.465	4.525	-0.063	

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 5. OLS Regression Coefficients for Aggregate Faculty Engagement of International Students for International Students and Students Overall

	All Students				International Students			
	B	S.E.	β	Sig.	B	S.E.	β	Sig.
Student-Faculty Interaction	.318	.060	.091	***	.675	.288	.190	*
Collaborative Learning	.050	.064	.013		.215	.330	.053	
Learning Strategies	.461	.072	.113	***	.095	.366	.022	

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Controls include student major field, educational aspirations, racial/ethnic identification, living situation, transfer status, class level, first-generation status, gender identity, estimated GPA, age.