International Students in the Classroom: A South African Evidence of Impact on Lecturer and Domestic Student Classroom Practices and Classroom Effectiveness

D. Y. Dzansi[1*] and L. Mogashoa[2]

**[1]Department of Business Support Studies, Faculty of Management Sciences,
Central University of Technology Free State, South Africa, 9301
E-mail: ddzansi@cut.ac.za
[2]School of Teacher Education, Faculty of Humanities, Central University of Technology
Free State, South Africa, 9301**

ABSTRACT This study considers the behavioural impacts of the presence of international students on domestic students and lecturers and classroom effectiveness with the underlying theory being, *learning does not take place in a vacuum but happens in a broad context with cultural sensitivity a major factor*. Although cultural sensitivity can manifest in many forms, the focus is on the *willingness of domestic students and lecturers to accommodate the special needs of international studentsby adapting their classroom behaviours and practices respectively*. The conceptual framework for examining changes in classroom behaviours and practices consists of *communication, teaching, assessment*, and *classroom organization* for lecturers and *communication* and *attitude* for domestic students. Based on the conceptual framework, rating scale questionnaires were developed and used to collect data from 20 lecturers and 350 domestic students. Results of the data analysis indicates that: (i) both local students and lecturers had to make major adaptions in their classroom behaviours and practices respectively in order to accommodate the needs of international students; and (ii) both sets of respondents are of the opinion that the changes made in their classroom behaviours and practices respectively have resulted in improved classroom effectiveness.

I. INTRODUCTION

An apparent influence of globalization on education is increased enrolment of international students in universities all over the world. The Central University of Technology (CUT), Free State like most other South African universities has been enrolling increasing numbers of international students to the extent that unlike in the past, post-1994 CUT classrooms have become much diversified.

I.1 Problem Statement

CUT may have joined the bandwagon of recruiting more and more international students due to its assumed benefits. However, as observed by Johnson (2008), international students always mean more challenges for teachers and local students because of student diversity. From this perspective, it is reasonable to expect the presence of international students to complicate student diversity challenges for CUT lecturers and domestic students.

Although South African Universities actively recruit international students, according to our

*Address for correspondence:
Professor Dennis Y Dzansi

best knowledge, to date, there has not been any research to determine what impact this practice has on classroom practices of lecturers and local students and classroom effectiveness. This creates a knowledge gap and lack of vital information that could be used firstly by South African universities to judge the benefits of foreign students. Cost-benefit-analysis is a tool that provides a consistent framework for evaluating decisions in terms of their consequences. From cost-benefit perspective, it makes sense for CUT to carefully evaluate the externalities of enrolling international students.

This study investigates the extent to which lecturers and local students in the School of Teacher Education (SOTE) at CUT have to change their classroom practices due to the presence of international students and the impact thereof (if any) on classroom effectiveness.

I.2 Research Questions

Based on the above problem the following four research questions were identified for investigation:

1. To what extent do lecturers have to change classroom practices in order to accommodate international students?

2. From lecturer perspective, what is the impact of these changes in classroom practices on classroom effectiveness?
3. To what extent do local students have to change classroom behaviours in order to accommodate international students?
4. From local student perspective, what is the impact of these changes on classroom effectiveness?

I.3 Theoretical Framework

The underlying theory guiding the study is that, learning does not take place in a vacuum but happens in a broad context (Ellison et al. 2000; Biggs 1997) with cultural sensitivity a major factor. According to thinkers in the field of education, cultural sensitivity in a multicultural classroom is an important factor that can make or break a student's educational experience. Therefore, local students and lecturers need to exercise cultural sensitivity towards international students. So, cultural sensitivity is relevant to classrooms with international students because cultural differences can have effect on classroom effectiveness and ultimately academic achievement. Furthermore, as will be discussed in the literature review, academic achievement is linked to lecturer and student behaviour in the classroom.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

II.1 Pros and Cons of International Students in the Classroom

As said above, CUT may have joined the bandwagon of recruiting more and more international students due to its assumed benefits. For instance, lecturer's job enrichment and new learning experience (Barron 2006; Peelo and Luxon 2007) are said to accrue to host institutions. Empirical evidence seems to support the idea of international students being beneficial to host institutions. Coate (2009) for example found that international students brought new insights to local students. Rowney and Taras (2007) also found that international students compelled local students to participate more actively in class; lecturers and local students experienced growth when international students are present in the classroom; and international students provided opportunities of first-hand

experience of learning in multicultural settings. Morrison et al. (2005) on their part found that international students improved work ethic of local students whereby, superior performance by international students motivated less capable domestic students to perform better.

But there can be equally negative consequences of international students in domestic classrooms (Ward 2001). In fact, critics always point out that international students in domestic classrooms always come at a cost. Johnson (2008) for instance contend that student diversity always goes with challenges for lecturers and domestic students whilst De Vita (2002) empirically found that the presence of international students often entail burdensome changes in the classroom practices of domestic students and lecturers and detrimental to classroom effectiveness. International students can also cause decline in the academic standards of local students (Lassegard 2006). For instance, Coate (2009) empirically found that academically weak international students slowed down local students' learning.

Thus, in spite of several advantages, as Barron (2006) alludes to, international student in the classroom is a mixed bag because it leads to cross-cultural challenges in the classroom, some of which are examined below.

II.2 Cross-cultural Issues in the Classroom

The literature review identified prior learning experiences; cultural adjustment shock; culturally responsive classroom; collaborative classroom environment; participation and communication in the classroom; teaching to accommodate international students; classroom organisation; and assessment as notable cross-cultural issues that arise when there are international students in the classroom. These issues are now briefly explored.

II.2.1 Prior Learning Experiences

Valiente (2008), Sayers and Franklin (2008), Peelo and Luxon (2007), Baron (2006), Robertson et al. (2000) and Biggs (1997) all agree that teaching in a multi-national classroom entails a lecturer to acknowledge and analyse prior learning of students because there are always overlaps and gaps due to national differences. Sayers and Franklin (2008) found

that although there are always some similarities in learning strategies, culturally distinct groups always have preferences.

II.2.2 Cultural Adjustment/Shock

It is only inevitable that like any sojourner, international students should experience *cultural shock* (Dzansi 2006). Ayliff and Wang (2006) describe *cultural* as the anxiety produced when a person moves to a new environment. Lecturers will therefore often be called upon to help international students deal with cultural shock in their new environment.

II.2.3 Culturally Sensitive Classrooms

In order to lessen cultural shock, researchers (Ball 2009; Deakins 2009; Brown 2007; Holvikivi 2007) call for *culturally responsive classrooms* - classrooms where everyone is sensitive to one another's needs. According to Brown (2007), cultural insensitivity can affect self-esteem and eventual academic success. Deakins (2009) believes that creating a 'blended culture' could lead to a culturally sensitive classroom for all.

II.2.4 Collaborative Classroom Environment

A culturally responsive classroom should lead to a *collaborative classroom environment* (Kim 2008; Jacob 2001; Park et al. 2009; Davies 2006; Barron 2006; Rowney and Taras 2007; Neri and Ville 2008) with the reverse also likely to be the case. But creating a collaborative classroom environment has been found to be very difficult in multicultural environment (Kim 2008; Jacob 2001). Davies (2006), Barron (2006), and Rowney and Taras (2007) all found reluctance in local and international students to readily mix. An often mentioned reason for this difficulty is that whilst some students come from societies where collaboration is emphasized, others are from those that emphasize competition (Park et al. 2009). Consequently, should lecturers in multinational classrooms assume complete control, some learners may become timid and not able to express themselves openly. On the other hand, should lecturers tend towards a balanced relationship, this may lead to classroom indiscipline. Lecturers must therefore exercise great caution in the lecturer-student rela-

tionships. This means lecturers have to be extra patient (Neri and Ville 2008) in engaging students from different cultures in classroom discussions.

II.2.5 Participation and Communication in the Classroom

Similar to classroom collaboration, *classroom participation* has been found to be a challenge for international students (Kim 2008; Wadsworth et al. 2008; Zhang and Brunton 2007; Rowney and Taras 2007; Lee 2007; Davies, 2006; Kim 2006; Zhou et al. 2005; Tatar 2005; Samarawickrema 2005; Holmes 2005; Jung and McCroskey 2004). According to Zhou et al. (2005), familiarity between international students is important for trust, motivation and feelings of comfort and safety in the classroom. Linked to participation is *classroom communication* difficulties (Jung and McCroskey 2004; Samarawickrema 2005; Holmes 2005; Zhang and Brunton 2007) of which *accent* is considered a major problem because of the tendency for people to react to non-familiar accents negatively. Negative reactions to accents can be intimidating for international students with the result that they may totally abstain from speaking out in the classroom (Lee 2007; Davies 2006).

II.2.6 Teaching to Accommodate International Students

International students complicate teaching and learning for domestic students and lectures because of the need for *teaching to accommodate international students* (Deakins 2009; Johnson 2008; Ayliff and Wang 2006; Biggs 2003). These authors opine that rather than attempting to assimilate international students into host culture, it is best to look for similarities with the ideal being that both sets of students need to adapt. These views challenge lecturers to design and implement learning experiences that enable students from all cultural groups to achieve academically (Thomas and Kearney 2008).

II.2.7 Classroom Organisation

An important development in education is emphasis on group work. Group work requires

proper *classroom organisation*. In South Africa, high lecturer to student ratio makes it imperative that groups are formed to make large classes manageable. Zhao and Wildemeersch (2008) believe optimal benefit can be reached by working in groups of mixed nationalities. Whilst group work can be a recipe for success, often, this may not easily be achieved because of cultural diversity. To offset cultural diversity problems in groups, Holvikivi (2007) advices that work among students should be conducted with close guidance by lecturers - a task that lecturers may find burdensome.

II.2.8 Assessment

In the final analysis, student work must be assessed to determine level of achievement. But some pertinent questions need to be answered. Firstly, one may ask, do the way South African lecturers assess cater for the needs of both local and international students? Alternatively one may ask, do South African lecturers need to develop special assessment skills to effectively cater for the needs of a across national setting? These questions are difficult to answer because, to date, no empirical data exists in South Africa to help answer these questions. This situation robs administrators of useful indicators to gauge the appropriateness of current assessment methods in the increasingly multicultural classrooms in South African university

III. METHODOLOGY

III.1 Research Design, Population, and Sampling

The study was conducted in the quantitative mode of inquiry. The target population was all the 20 lecturers and 1429 undergraduate local students in the School of Teacher Education (SOTE) at CUT in 2011. Participants consisted of all 20 lecturers and a sample of 350 local students. Proportional sampling was used to determine the sample size of each program offered in the school thereafter, simple random sampling was used then used to select samples from each program. This strategy was adopted to ensure that each program is well represented. The sample distribution by program is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Sample size distribution

Program	Number enrolled	Sample size	
Technical	8	8/1429X350 =	**2**
Economic and management sciences (EMS)	558	558/1429X350 =	**137**
Computer sciences	144	144/1429X350 =	**35**
Languages	270	270/1429X350 =	**66**
Natural sciences	359	359/1429X350 =	**88**
Technology	90	90/1429X350 =	**22**
Total number of undergraduates	1429		350

III.3 Data Collection

Rating scale questionnaire was used to collect data from participants. Respondents were required to indicate the extent of adjustments made in classroom behaviours and practices on the scale 1 = never; 2 = occasionally; 3 = often; and 4 = always. Respondents also had to indicate their perceptions of impact of adjustments made in classroom behaviours and practices on classroom effectiveness on the scale 1 = high negative impact; 2 = medium negative impact; 3 = low negative impact; 4 = no impact; 5 = low positive impact; 6 = medium positive impact; and 7 = high positive impact.

III.4 Data Analysis

Data collected were analysed using the statistical package SPSS. CUT's Institutional Planning and Research Unit did the data capturing and analysis. The data analysis produced descriptive statistics in the form of frequency tables, averages (means), rank order, percentage analysis, and Average Weighted Response (AWR). The extent of adjustments made were measured in terms of frequency counts, percentage analyses and average weighted responses (AWRs) with AWR = "fx/n where f represents the number of respondents (frequency), x represents the numerical rating assigned to adjustment in a classroom practice by each respondent ranging from 1 to 4 and n stands for the sample size. The impacts of adjustments in classroom practices on classroom effectiveness as perceived by students and lecturers were measured by frequency counts, percentage analyses and AWRs with AWR = "fx/n Where f, n and x mean the same things as above with x ranging from 1 to 7. The ratings are interpreted according to Table 2.

Table 2: Rules for rating extent of adjustments in classroom practices

Rating	AWR	Interpretation
1 = never made adjustments	Not greater than 1	No adjustment
2 = occasionally made adjustments	Greater than 1 and up to 2	Minor adjustment
3 = often made adjustments	Greater than 2 and up to 4	Major adjustment
4 = always made adjustment		

Rules for rating impact of adjustments in classroom practices

Rating	AWR	Interpretation
1 = high negative	From 1 up to maximum 3	Negative impact
2 = medium negative		
3 = low negative		
4 = no impact	Greater than 3 up maximum 4	No impact
5 = low positive	Greater than 4 up maximum 7	Positive impact
6 = medium positive		
7 = high positive		

III.5 Ensuring Credibility of the Measurement Instrument

Every research has validity and reliability issues and this study was no exception particularly because the measurement instrument used was custom made. Although there are many ways to address validity, specific efforts were made to ensure content and construct validity. Content validity for the current instrument was assured through extensive review of relevant literature that resulted in identification of measurement questions that were deemed to adequately measure all dimensions of classroom practices relevant to the SOTE CUT situation. Furthermore, the questionnaires were circulated amongst notable researchers in the field of educational research whose feedbacks were incorporated in the final questionnaires used. In terms of reliability, there is a general agreement that participant error and bias and observer error and bias constitute the main threats to reliability (Saunders and Thornhill 2000; Zikmund 2003; Bell 2005; Cooper and Schindler 2008). To minimise inaccurate responses, sensitive questions were avoided and to enhance response rate, only willing participants were included in the sample. The structured questionnaires used were thoroughly reviewed and revised time and over to reduce ambiguity hence reduce observer errors and biases.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

IV.1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants

IV.1.1 Lecturer Student Ratio

Although this was not an objective, it is important to report and reflect on the student/lecturer ratio because the data analysis reveals an interesting situation. It was earlier reported that in 2011, there were 1429 local students and a total of 20 lecturers at SOTE meaning a ratio of 71 local students to one lecturer (and this could be worse if international students are included). This ratio is twice the national norm of 35 students to one lecturer in South African. This is a major problem confronting not only SOTE but CUT at large. It is important to however mention that this problem is not unique to CUT but is a common feature of most South African Universities.

IV.1.2 Response Rate

Out of the 350 questionnaires distributed to students, 321 correctly completed were returned representing a 91.7% response rate. With regard to lecturers, 19 out of the 20 questionnaires sent out were correctly completed and returned which represents a 95% response rate. Following are the demographic results and findings related to the four research questions.

IV.1.3 Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Firstly, demographic characteristics of participants are shown in Table 3 with the most striking finding on students being that, Economics and Management Sciences (EMS) (32.3%), Natural Science (NS) (32.3%), and Computer Science (CS) (18.4%) are the most popular fields of study for local students. That EMS, NS, and CS programs dominate enrolment figures at SOTE should not surprise anyone but should be seen as SOTE's strategic response to market needs since these three are skills shortage areas in South African schools. With regard to lecturers, the most interesting finding concerns lecturer *diversity* and *multiculturalism*. According to Table 3, a high percentage (84.2%) of lecturers good understanding of the concepts *diversity* and *multiculturalism*. This augurs well for

effectively managing multicultural classrooms in SOTE.

IV.2 Impact of Presence of International Students

IV.2.1 Lecturers' Classroom Practices and Classroom Effectiveness

In accordance with the interpretation criteria (see Table 2), changes in lecturers' classroom practices (*classroom communication* AWR = 2.83; *assessment* AWR = 2.32; *classroom organisation* AWR = 2.46) as indicated in Tables 4, 5, and 6 respectively show that overall, lecturers made major adjustments in the three broad classroom practices investigated. It is also noteworthy that of the five classroom communication items, *avoiding informal language* with AWR = 3.21 (see Table 4) was the most adapted whilst *simplifying of grammar* with AWR = 2.68 was the least adapted. Similarly, in accordance with the interpretation criteria (see Table 2), the AWR values for classroom effectiveness where *classroom communication* AWR = 5.27, *assessment* AWR = 5.26 and *classroom organisation* AWR = 4.8 (see Tables 4, 5 and 6) show that overall, lecturers believe the adjustments they made in these three classroom practices due to the presence of international students made positive impact on classroom effectiveness.

IV.2.2 Students' Classroom Practices and Classroom Effectiveness

In accordance with the interpretation criteria (see Table 2) the AWR of 2.78 (see Table 7) for changes in students' classroom practices and behaviours indicates that overall, domestic students made major adjustments in the practices and behaviours investigated. Similarly, in accordance with the interpretation criteria (see Table 2), the mean AWR of 5.27 (see Table 7) indicates that local students at SOTE believe that adjustments they made in their classroom practices in order to accommodate international students had positive impact on classroom effectiveness.

V. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of international students on lecturer

Table 3: Demographic data

Variables		Fre-quency	Percent-age
local students			
Gender	Male	141	42.6%
	Female	190	57.4%
Age	16 - 20	164	49.5%
	21 - 25	144	43.5%
	26 - 30	14	4.2%
	31 - 35	7	2.1%
	36 +	2	0.6%
Learning Programme	EMS	107	32.3%
	Natural Science	107	32.3%
	Computer Science	61	18.4%
	Technology	28	8.5%
	Technical	28	8.5%
Year of Study	First year	168	50.8%
	Second year	104	31.4%
	Third year	57	17.2%
	Fourth year	2	0.6%
Home Language	Afrikaans	9	2.7%
	English	9	2.7%
	Setswana	46	13.9%
	Sesotho	192	58.0%
	isiZulu	75	22.7%
Environment Where Learner Grew Up	Farm	9	2.7%
	Location	219	66.2%
	Village	43	13%
	City	60	18.1%
Lecturers			
Gender	Male	13	68.4%
	Female	6	31.6%
Teaching Programme	EMS	3	15.8%
	Natural Science	5	26.3%
	Computer Science	3	15.8%
	Technology	3	15.8%
	Technical	5	26.3%
Rank (position)	Junior Lecturer	6	31.6%
	Lecturer	9	47.4%
	Senior Lecturer	1	5.3%
	Lecturer/ Programme Head	2	10.5%
	Senior Lecturer/ Programme Head	1	5.3%
Length of Stay at CUT	2 years or less	9	47.4%
	3 – 5 years	5	26.3%
	6 – 9 years	4	21.1%
	10 years or more	1	5.3%
Home Language	Afrikaans	2	10.5%
	English	1	5.3%
	Setswana	9	47.4%
	Sesotho	3	15.8%
	isiZulu	4	21.1%
Fluency in English Language	Average	1	5.3%
	Good	7	36.8%
	Very Good	7	36.8%
	Excellent	4	21.1%
Understanding of the Concepts Diversity and Multi-culture	No understanding	0	0%
	Average	3	15.8%
	Good	6	31.6%
	Very Good	8	42.1%
	Excellent	2	10.5%

classroom practices, domestic student classroom behaviours and classroom effectiveness. The results of this study confirm the literature that teaching and assessment methods cannot be fixed under any circumstance especially when there are international students. Rather, they

Table 4: Adjustments in lecturer communication practices and impact on classroom effectiveness

Classroom communication practices	Extent of adjustment								AWR	Rank
	None		Minor		Major					
	Never		Occasionally		Often		Always			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Simplifying grammar	3	15.8	5	26.3	6	31.6	5	26.3	**2.68**	5
Simplifying vocabulary	2	10.5	6	31.6	6	31.6	5	26.3	**2.73**	4
Avoiding informal language	2	10.5	1	5.3	7	36.8	9	47.4	**3.21**	1
Avoiding local language to explain difficult concepts	4	21.1	3	15.8	6	31.6	6	31.6	**2.74**	3
Emphasizing or repeatedly pronouncing certain words	2	10.5	5	26.3	7	36.8	5	26.3	**2.79**	2
"Sub-average" AWR									**2.83**	

Classroom communication practices	Impact on classroom effectiveness														AWR	Rank
	Negative						None		Positive							
	High		Medium		Low				Low		Medium		High			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Simplifying grammar	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	26.3	5	26.3	6	31.6	3	15.8	**5.37**	2
Simplifying vocabulary	0	0	1	5.3	2	10.5	4	21.1	5	26.3	4	21.1	3	15.8	**4.95**	4
Avoiding informal language	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	21.1	3	15.8	8	42.1	3	15.8	**5.32**	3
Avoiding using local language to explain difficult concepts	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	26.3	2	10.5	5	26.3	7	36.8	**5.74**	1
Emphasizing or repeatedly pronouncing certain words	0	0	1	5.3	3	15.8	3	15.8	3	15.8	7	36.8	2	10.5	**4.95**	4
"Sub-average" AWR															**5.27**	

Table 5: Adjustments in lecturers' teaching and assessment practices and impact on classroom effectiveness

Teaching and assessment practices	Extent of adjustment								AWR	Rank
	None		Minor		Major					
	Never		Occasionally		Often		Always			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Using universal examples	0	0	3	15.8	6	31.6	10	52.6	**3.37**	1
Using differentiated teaching	1	3	4	21.1	8	42.1	6	31.6	**3**	2
Adjusting style of questioning	2	10.5	2	10.5	12	63.2	3	15.8	**2.84**	3
Reading/studying materials on cultural sensitivity	2	10.5	5	26.3	6	31.6	6	31.6	**2.84**	3
Changing expectations when assessing students	6	31.6	3	15.8	8	42.1	2	10.5	**2.32**	5
"Sub-average" AWR									**2.87**	

Teaching and assessment practices	Impact on classroom effectiveness														AWR	Rank
	Negative						None		Positive							
	High		Medium		Low				Low		Medium		High			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Using universal examples	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15.8	2	10.5	9	47.4	5	26.3	**5.84**	1
Using differentiated teaching	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	4	21.1	1	5.3	8	42.1	5	26.3	**5.63**	2
Adjusting style of questioning	0	0	0	0	1	5.3	5	26.3	3	15.8	8	42.1	2	10.5	**5.26**	3
Reading/studying materials on cultural sensitivity	0	0	1	5.3	1	5.3	3	15.8	7	36.8	4	21.1	3	15.8	**5.11**	4
Changing expectations when assessing students	1	5.3	1	5.3	2	10.5	6	31.6	3	15.8	5	26.3	1	5.3	**4.47**	5
"Sub-average" AWR															**5.26**	

Table 6: Adjustment in lecturers' classroom organisation practices and impact on classroom effectiveness

Classroom organisation practices	Extent of adjustment								AWR	Rank
	None		Minor		Major					
	Never		Occasionally		Often		Always			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Personally intervening in group formation	4	21.1	2	10.5	10	52.6	3	15.8	**2.63**	2
Monitoring progress of groups that have international students	5	26.3	6	31.6	5	26.3	3	15.8	**2.32**	3
Changing classroom behaviour rules	4	21.1	1	5.3	9	47.4	5	26.3	**2.79**	1
Making sure that all students get help from other classmates irrespective of nationality	9	47.4	1	5.3	7	36.8	2	10.5	**2.11**	4
"Sub-average" AWR									**2.46**	

Classroom organisation practices	Impact on classroom effectiveness														AWR	Rank
	Negative						None		Positive							
	High		Medium		Low				Low		Medium		High			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Personally intervening in group formation	0	0	0	.0	1	5.3	5	26.3	4	21.1	6	31.6	3	15.8	**5.26**	1
Monitoring progress of groups that have international students	1	5.3	1	5.3	1	5.3	6	31.6	4	21.1	4	21.1	2	10.5	**4.63**	3
Changing classroom behaviour rules	2	10.5	0	.0	1	5.3	4	21.1	2	10.5	9	47.4	1	5.3	**4.84**	2
Making sure that all students get help from other classmates irrespective of nationality	1	5.3	1	5.3	2	10.5	6	31.6	3	15.8	5	26.3	1	5.3	**4.47**	4
"Sub-average" AWR															**4.8**	

Table 7: Adjustment in students' classroom practices and behaviours

Classroom practices and behaviours	Extent of adjustment								AWR	Rank
	None		Minor		Major					
	Never		Occasionally		Often		Always			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Simplifying language when speaking	35	10.6	93	28.1	120	36.3	83	25.1	**2.76**	5
Avoiding informal language when speaking	21	6.3	66	19.9	117	35.3	127	38.4	**3.06**	1
Avoiding the use of local language when speaking	22	6.6	67	20.2	112	33.8	130	39.3	**3.06**	1
Emphasizing certain words when speaking	30	9.1	81	24.5	139	42.0	81	24.5	**2.82**	4
Using shorter sentences when speaking	51	15.4	111	33.5	111	33.5	58	17.5	**2.53**	8
Repeating myself when speaking	60	18.1	95	28.7	111	33.5	65	19.6	**2.55**	7
Changing my accent when speaking	117	35.3	65	19.6	84	25.4	65	19.6	**2.29**	9
Showing extra patience during discussions	31	9.4	60	18.1	122	36.9	118	35.6	**2.99**	3
Showing sensitivity towards people.	34	10.3	54	16.3	104	31.4	139	42.0	**3.05**	2
Changing my overall classroom behaviour	61	18.4	75	22.7	103	31.1	92	27.8	**2.68**	6
"Sub-average" AWR									**2.78**	

Classroom practices and behaviours	Impact on classroom effectiveness														AWR	Rank
	Negative						None		Positive							
	High		Medium		Low				Low		Medium		High			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Simplifying language when speaking	4	1.2	30	9.1	6	1.8	40	12.1	39	11.8	156	47.1	56	16.9	**5.33**	4
Avoiding informal language when speaking	7	2.1	18	5.4	19	5.7	34	10.3	51	15.4	114	34.4	88	26.6	**5.41**	1
Avoiding the use of local language when speaking	14	4.2	16	4.8	14	4.2	36	10.9	51	15.4	104	31.4	96	29.0	**5.39**	2
Emphasizing certain words when speaking	7	2.1	18	5.4	24	7.3	38	11.5	48	14.5	114	34.4	82	24.8	**5.33**	4
Using shorter sentences when speaking	13	3.9	18	5.4	30	9.1	44	13.3	62	18.7	109	32.9	55	16.6	**5.03**	8

Table 7: Contd.....

Classroom practices and behaviours	Impact on classroom effectiveness																	AWR	Rank
	Negative						None		Positive										
	High		Medium		Low				Low		Medium		High						
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%						
Repeating myself when speaking	14	4.2	18	5.4	24	7.3	42	12.7	48	14.5	116	35.0	69	20.8					**5.16**	6
Changing my accent when speaking	32	9.7	24	7.3	16	4.8	63	19.0	53	16.0	81	24.5	62	18.7					**4.73**	9
Showing extra patience during discussions	12	3.6	15	4.5	22	6.6	39	11.8	41	12.4	102	30.8	100	30.2					**5.38**	3
Showing sensitivity towards people.	13	3.9	20	6.0	15	4.5	53	16.0	31	9.4	107	32.3	92	27.8					**5.29**	5
Changing my overall classroom behaviour	22	6.6	15	4.5	16	4.8	57	17.2	38	11.5	98	29.6	85	25.7					**5.14**	7
"Sub-average" AWR																			**5.27**	

need to be flexible enough to cater as much as possible for diverse needs.

From impact perspective, our results indicate only positive impacts. Specifically, the first research question was "To what extent do lecturers have to change or adapt classroom practices in order to accommodate international students?" The higher than average mean AWRs (see Tables 4, 5, 6) led us to conclude that overall, lecturers at CUT's School of Teacher Education, often made major adjustments in their classroom practices in order to accommodate the needs of international students.

The second research question was "From lecturer's perspective, what impact did resultant changes in classroom practices in order to accommodate international students have on the classroom effectiveness"? As reported above the mean AWRs reported in Tables 4, 5 and 6 led us to conclude that overall, felt international students had positive impact on classroom effectiveness.

The third research question was "To what extent do local students have to change their classroom behaviours in order to accommodate international students"? The mean AWRs as shown in Table 7 led us to conclude that local students often made major adjustments in their classroom practices in order to accommodate international students.

The final research question was "From local student's perspective, what impact do international students have on the classroom practices (both positive and negative)"? The mean AWRs reported in Tables 7 made us conclude that local students at SOTE believe international students had positive impact on classroom effectiveness.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our findings we advise that whenever there is a classroom that includes international students, it is imperative that lecturers always review and where necessary adapt their teaching and assessment methods. Also, like lecturers, local students will have to adapt their behaviours in order to make life more bearable for international students.

The study result vindicates CUT's policy of admitting (actually reserving places for) international students. However, this policy needs to be approached with caution because lecturers and domestic students must make compromises and sacrifices.

Surely, willingness on the part of domestic students and lecturers to make sacrifices in order to accommodate the special needs of international students will largely depend on knowledge of what is in it for them. In other words, informed consent is required and this can only happen when appropriate information regarding the benefits of international students is properly conveyed to domestic students and lecturers. Such information also needs to be disseminated to opinion leaders and the general South African populace. Policy makers and university administrators would have to take on this responsibility.

Furthermore, it is evident that handling a multicultural classroom is an arduous task that requires special skills. Lecturers need to be given appropriate and adequate training especially on cultural sensitivity. Also, local students should be orientated to embrace the cultures of international students and to work closely with them in the classroom because of the positive impact they bring to the local classroom.

In terms of research, the limited nature of the study and its consequences thereof for generalizability as stated earlier can be improved by extending the research to include a country wide survey. Secondly, due to the nature of the study, the survey was only limited to local students and lecturers thus neglecting international students' perspective. To get a fuller understanding of the topic, it is recommended that international students' views be included in future research. Finally, this was a mainly quantitative study that enabled a wide spectrum of issues to be considered and as many respondents to be reached. We suggest that a qualitative study should be conducted to further interrogate emergent issues in order to gain a much deeper understanding of the topic.

REFERENCES

Ayliff D, Wang G 2006. Experiences of Chinese international students learning English at South African tertiary institutions. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 20(3): 25-37.

Ball AF 2009. Towards a theory of generative change in culturally and linguistically complex classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(1): 45-72.

Barron P 2006. Stormy outlook? Domestic students' impressions of international students at an Australian university. *Journal of Teaching in Travel and Tourism*, 6(2): 5-22

Bell J 2005. *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-time Researchers in Education, Health and Social Science*. 4th Edition. London: Open University Press.

Brown MR 2007. Educating all students: Creating culturally responsive teachers, classrooms, and schools. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 43(1): 57-62.

Coate K 2009. Exploring the unknown: Levinas and international students in English higher education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 4(3): 271-282.

Cooper DR, Schindler PS 2008. *Business Research Methods*. 10th Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Davies M 2006. Teaching International students in Tutorials. Teaching and Learning Unit. The University of Melbourne. From <http: //tlu.ecom.unimelb.edu.au/tutors> (Retrieved on 22 February 2011).

De Vita G 2002. Cultural equivalence in the assessment of home and international Business management students: A United Kingdom exploratory study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(2): 221-231.

Deakins E 2009. Helping students value cultural diversity through research-based teaching. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 28(2): 209-226.

Dzansi DY 2006. *An Analysis of the Adjustment Problems of International Students in a South African University*. Master's Dissertation, Unpublished. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.

Ellison CM, Boykin AW, Towns DP, Stokes A 2000. Classroom Cultural Ecology: The Dynamics of Classroom Life in Schools Serving Low-Income African American Children. From <http://www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/techReports/Report44.pdf.> (Retrieved on 22 February 2011).

Holmes P 2005. Ethnic Chinese students' communication with cultural others in New Zealand University. *National Communication Association*, 54(4): 289-311.

Holvikivi J 2007. Culture and cognition in information technology education. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 32(1): 73-82.

Jacob EJ 2001. Using counsellor training and collaborative programming strategies in working with international students. *Journal of Multicultural Counselling and Development*, 29(1): 1-11.

Johnson EM 2008. An investigation into pedagogical challenges facing international tertiary-level students in New Zealand. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 27(3): 231-243.

Jung JY, McCroskey JC 2004. Communication apprehension in a first language and self perceived competence as predictors of communication apprehension in second language: A study of speakers of English as a second language. *Communication Quarterly*, 52(2): 170-181.

Kim S 2006. Teaching international students. *Supporting, Listening, and Speaking*, 2(3): 337-353.

Kim S 2008. Silent participation: East Asian international graduate students' views on active classroom participation. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*, 19(2 and 3): 199-220.

Lassegard JP 2006. International student quality and Japanese higher education reform. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(2): 119-140.

Lee JJ 2007. Neo-racism towards international students: A critical need for change. *About Campus*, 11(6): 28-30.

Morrison J, Merrick B, Higgs S, Le Métais J 2005. Researching the performance of international students in the United Kingdom. *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(3): 327-337.

Neri F, Ville S 2008. Social capital renewal and the academic performance of international students in Australia. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37(4): 1515-1538.

Park HS Lee SA, Yun D, Kim W 2009. The impact of instructor decision authority and verbal and nonverbal immediacy on Korean student satisfaction in the US and South Korea. *Communication Education*, 58(2): 189-212.

Peelo M, Luxon T 2007. Designing embedded courses to support international students' cultural and academic adjustment in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 31(1): 65-76.

Robertson M, Line M, Jones S, Thomas S 2000. International students, learning environments and perceptions: A case study using Delphi technique. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 19(1): 90-102.

Rowney J, Taras V 2007. Effects of cultural diversity on in-class communication and student project team dynamics: Creating synergy in the diverse classroom. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 35(2): 67-81.

Samarawickrema RG 2005. Determinants of student readiness for flexible learning: Some preliminary findings. *Distance Education*, 26(1): 49-66.

Saunders M, Lewis P, Thornhill A 2000. *Research Methods for Business Students*. 2nd Edition. Harlow: Prentice-Hall.

Sayers J, Franklin T 2008. Cultural shock! Cultural issues in a tertiary course using reflective techniques. *Reflective Practice*, 9(1): 79-88.

Tatar S 2005. Classroom participation by international students: The case of Turkish graduate students. *Journal of Studies on International Education*, 9(4): 337-355.

Thomas S, Kearney J 2008. Teachers working in cultural diverse classrooms: Implications for the development of professional standards and for teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(2): 105-120.

Valiente C 2008. Are students using the 'wrong' style of learning? *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 9(1): 73-91.

Wadsworth BC, Hecht ML, Jung E 2008. The role of identity gaps, discrimination and acculturation in international students' educational satisfaction in American classroom. *Communication Education*, 57(1): 64-87.

Ward C 2001. The Impact of International Students on Domestic Students and Host Institutions. From <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/international/the_impact_of_international_students_on_domestic_students_and_host_institutions> (Retrieved on the 13 June 2012).

Zhang Z, Brunton M 2007. Differences in living and learning: Chinese international students in New Zealand. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(2): 124-140.

Zhao M, Wildemeersch D 2008. Hosting foreign students in European universities: International and intercultural perspectives. *European Education*, 40(1): 51-62.

Zhou YR, Knoke D, Sakamoto I 2005. Rethinking silence in the classroom: Chinese students' experiences of sharing indigenous knowledge. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 9(3): 287-311.

Zikmund WG 2003. *Business Research Methods.* 7th Edition. Ohio: South-West Publishers.