

For Their Own Good: Class Room Observations on the Social and Academic Integration of International and Domestic Students

Antje Cockrill

University of Wales Trinity St David, United Kingdom

This paper presents the outcomes of three small studies which explore if students in diverse student groups seek and want academic and social integration. This includes an attempt to identify the facilitating factors and barriers for this process. Factors identified as facilitating integration are small group size, lack of access to compatriots and sufficient staff time and resources to create an intentional process of integration. Barriers to academic and social integration were situations where the majority of domestic students come from one area; large groups of international students from the same country and finally, a lack of resources to actively facilitate integration in a planned, interventional way.

INTRODUCTION

This paper is the result of the author's long standing interest in the social and academic experiences of international students, and brings together the outcomes of three small studies which have been conducted in the last four years. The overall research aim of this paper is to explore the question if students in diverse student groups seek and want academic and social integration. More detailed research objectives include an attempt to establish if academic and social integration fostered by the institution is beneficial; how such integration can be best achieved, and finally, which barriers need to be overcome to address challenges in this area.

CONTEXT AND LITERATURE

The emphasis of this paper is on social interaction and with this, integrated learning experiences of domestic and international students. International education is a growing phenomenon, the most recent available figures suggest that in 2014 the number of internationally mobile students surpassed the 5 million mark, and that the number of internationally mobile students will reach 7 million in 2022 (CBIE, 2016). This means that since 1990 international student enrolment has more than tripled (ICEF, 2015). The top 10 destination countries are the US, the UK, France, Australia, Germany, Russian Federation, Japan, Canada, China and Italy. By far the most students come from China (over 700k students), followed by India, Germany and the Republic of Korea, which are also the home countries of relatively large numbers (over 100k each) of internationally mobile students (UNESCO, 2016). Specifically, in the UK there were 438,010 international students in 2015-16 (UKISCA) and for the USA this figure was more than one million (Xia, 2016)

There seems to be a wide-spread consensus among researchers and academics alike that internationalization of the student body and diversity of viewpoints are a cornerstone of a global education. Therefore acceptance and integration of international students is a 'must' in an university's internationalization process (British Council, 2014). Owens and Loomes (2010) maintain that social

integration has been identified as a critical factor supporting successful, engaging and satisfying learning experiences (p.276) of international students; and that lack of integration diminishes or negatively impacts on the international student experience (McNamara & Skorka, 2007; Sovic, 2009). Furthermore, integration is seen as a vehicle to prepare all students, domestic and international alike, for work and life in an increasingly diverse world and workplace environment (Young et al, 2014).

The term 'integration' is somewhat nebulous, although there is agreement amongst authors that it is a multifaceted and multidimensional term. For example, Spencer-Oatey (2014) maintains that this term has multiple dimensions such as the process of getting people of different races to live and work together instead of separately; spending time with members of other groups and to develop habits like theirs; combining two or more people so that they work together effectively; and people becoming part of a group or society and being accepted by them are all (Spencer-Oatey, 2014). These elements suggest a dynamic, ongoing process which individuals and larger communities engage in. Young et al (2014) have taken this further by defining 'integration' as "an intentional process to create community, by encouraging domestic and international students to engage with each other in ongoing interaction, characterized by mutual respect, responsibility, action, and commitment" (Young et al, 2014). One of the most important aspects of this definition is the notion that integration is done with and among groups, but not for a single group, and that there is a great deal of intentionality around integration (Young et al, 2014). It needs to be emphasized here that there are at least two different levels to this process, namely personal (social) integration and academic integration.

So if integration in the HE context is something that is being done intentionally rather than being a naturally occurring process, and if university staff see integration as a 'must' which fosters the social and learning experience of international and domestic students, the question has to be asked to which extent this aspect is important for students.

As mentioned earlier, the UK is the second most popular destination for international students after the USA. Since 2007 the three key reasons for international students to study in the UK have been consistently career prospects, internationally recognized qualifications and university reputation (British Council, 2014). Living in a multicultural environment follows much lower on the priority list.

As for British students, recent data shows that only 4.5% (10,520) of the cohort graduating in 2012/13 had at least one period of mobility between 2010/11 and 2012/13 (Boe & Hurley, 2015). This compares to around 438,010 international students studying in the UK, with around 20% of these being from China (UKCISA, 2017). This implies that the internationalization process in the UK is largely a one way process (Owens & Loomes, 2010). It could be argued that this reflects a relative disinterest of British students to study abroad or to study in a second language, and thus to engage with students from other cultures. Furthermore, there is a reluctance to engage with international students because domestic students may see international students as a threat to their own marks or learning experiences when international students' English level or performance is weak; or a threat to their comfort levels when they have to make an effort to communicate with those whose English is weak or who lack the culture-specific knowledge to follow conversations (Ward, 2001; Summers, 2008, Harrison & Peacock, 2010; Harrison, 2012). There may also be peer pressure not to cross cultural boundaries and to 'stick to your own'. In an American study, Lee and Rice (2007) pointed towards the concept of 'neo-racism', discrimination of individuals based on their nationality and its perception, rather than on biological race as a cause for students' lack of integration.

These issues are compounded by the tendency of especially Asian students to make friends amongst their compatriots and to 'self-segregate', which may feed the fears of domestic students and prevents the improvement of English language skills (McNamara & Skorka, 2007). Whilst many international students ask for greater integration (Turner, 2006, Zhang & Brunton, 2007)), the cultural complexities of their own background also mitigate against this process. McNamara and Skorka (2007) maintain that members of collectivist cultures usually belong to fewer groups (work, universities, family) as those in more individualistic societies and therefore these groups will significantly influence their behavior across situations. In this sense, many Chinese may view forming friendships with local students as unimportant or even undesirable.

All of these above leads back to Young et al's (2014) point that integration of diverse student groups is an intentional process - diversity of a student group in itself does not necessarily lead to integration (Spencer-Oatey, 2014). A Canadian study by Scott et al (2015) comes to a similar conclusion, maintaining that 'simply having international students in the same classroom as local students does not foster meaningful social interaction and learning between the two groups'. In this context Ward (2001) suggests that significant intercultural interaction is unlikely to occur spontaneously to any large extent, and it is almost certain that interventionist strategies need to be introduced to promote more and better intercultural activities and more successful integration of diverse student groups. Therefore, it is the purpose of this paper to explore which conditions facilitate or create barriers for successful integration of diverse student groups.

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

This paper reports the results of three individual studies conducted between 2012 and 2015. All studies were conducted in the UK, but involve two different universities in the same locale.

Study 1

This is the second part of a larger quantitative study (Cockrill and Harris, 2015). This study was survey based, and the questionnaire included (not reported in previous papers) a section on the social and academic integration of international and domestic students. This section consisted of six questions (see Appendix A) which explored the interactions between international and British students by asking them to which extent they talked, studied and socialized with each other. The survey was piloted and distributed in class to 250 students at a mid-sized UK university. All modules used for this research were general Marketing modules and all students were taught in medium sized or large groups. Classes visited covered Year 1 to postgraduate level and all included a mix of domestic and international students. 189 questionnaires were returned, of which 148 were complete. The data collection took place during December 2013. The basic demographics of the sample can be found in Appendix B.

T-tests were used to explore if there are differences in the interactions between British and non-British students. The results implied that both social and academic integration in these student groups was very limited. On all six questions asked, the differences were significant at the 0.001 level. (Appendix C). British students reported to study and socialize with other British students, and international students study and socialize with other international students. 55% of British students answered that they never studied with international students; and a further 32% stated that they only sometimes studied with international students. Nearly 20% of British students stated that they never talked to international students and another 45% stated that they only sometimes do – in the context of a highly internationalized study environment. When it comes to socializing, the lack of interaction was similar, with 80% of British students claiming that they never or only sometimes socialize with international students. However, this was not one sided. 69% of international students never or only sometimes studied with British students, 57% never or only sometimes talked to British students, and only 31% interacted socially with British students frequently or always.

This prompted a deeper exploration of the students and classes who were asked to participate in the study and two factors were identified which might have acted as barriers towards integration. Firstly, the majority of the British students were local, or came from within a 100 mile radius. This has implications for student integration. Domestic students who are local or can go home easily at the weekend do not have a prominent need at university to make new friends or to alter their friendship groups – so there is little motivation for domestic students to socialize or study with international students. Secondly, all the groups who participated were large and the majority of the international students were from China. With so many compatriots to choose from, it is easier to make friends and study with other Chinese students rather than having to make the effort to adapt both culturally and linguistically to students from other nationalities. Non-Chinese international students also all had smaller or larger groups of compatriots to choose from. The impact of such a class composition has been discussed by Sullivan and Kashubeck-

West (2015) who found that for international students home country support and an emphasis on maintaining ties to the home culture are not beneficially associated with adapting to studies in the host country and indeed impeded this process.

Study 2 - Introduction

Based on the results of Study 1, the author decided to embark on an action research study exploring these issues further. Student interviews with domestic and international students were considered but rejected as a methodology as it would have been very difficult to obtain interviews free of bias, the very act of being interviewed by a staff member would have influenced the students' responses. Therefore, an action research approach was chosen. Action research can be defined as "a disciplined process of inquiry conducted *by* and *for* those taking the action. The primary reason for engaging in action research is to assist the "actor" in improving and/or refining his or her actions." (Sagor, 2000). It is a multiple stage process which actively involves the researcher at each stage. Depending on the detail, the number of stages varies, Sagor (2000) identified seven, beginning with finding a focus, selecting a focus, clarifying theories, identifying research questions, collecting data, analyzing data, reporting results, taking informed action. Other authors have simplified this to fewer steps, e.g. Smith suggests a 'look, think, act model' (Smith 1996; 2001, 2007) or Cobe (2005) developed a four stage model of planning, acting, observing reflecting. This process then leads to further research questions and a repetition of the cycle until a satisfactory solution to the issue or question has been found, or a natural stopping point has been reached. For this study, Cobe's (2005) four stage model has been used. In its very nature, action research is recursive, iterative, and spiraling, which may also mean that a research question may change and be refined as new data and issues surface in the research study (Pine, 2009). McNiff (2002) maintains that self-reflection is a key element of action research as in action research "researchers do research on themselves. Empirical researchers enquire into other people's lives. Action researchers enquire into their own. Action research is an enquiry conducted by the self into the self." (McNiff, 2002, p. 6). This is particularly pertinent for these studies as the author shares her students' experience of studying abroad but also has many years' experience of living and teaching in the UK and thus has in-depth insights into both international and domestic students' experiences.

This study took place in January – May 2015. The research process for Study 2 and Study 3 was similar. Notes were kept, student feedback was collected and staff in the School(s) were consulted. This material was analyzed by using content analysis. Another important aspect was observation, relevant behavior was also recorded. Great care was taken to ensure that confidentiality and anonymity of students has been retained.

Study 2 Cycle 1

Planning: The context of this study was a large Level 6 module (115) with many international students at a different UK university but the cohort shared many of the characteristics of the cohort in Study 1. 26% (30) of the students were British, almost all of these students were local, from within a 50 mile radius. In addition there were a large number 47% (55) Chinese students, 12% (11) students from Saudi Arabia, and smaller contingents of European and African students. Most of the international students were final year entry students so had spent a comparatively short time in the UK, similar to many of the international students in Study 1.

Research objective: To find a way to foster academic and social integration in this diverse student group, especially in light of the results of Study 1.

This module involved each student working on a very individual larger project, and in order to support this, the group needed to be split into small (5-8 students) tutorial groups. This module design offered the opportunity to assign students to heterogeneous groups and thus to foster integration, as students could be assigned to groups regardless of nationality, culture or friendship group. This type of randomization can allow students to develop strategies which help to overcome some of the initial cultural barriers that prevented students to learn together in multi-national groups (Rienties et al, 2014).

Another strand of research suggests that students who are permitted to work in self-selected groups achieve better perceived communication, are more enthusiastic about working together, are more positive about their perceived group outcomes (Chapman et al 2006), have higher levels of (perceived) commitment, trust, and relational satisfaction (Meyers, 2011). There are caveats, though - self-selection can also lead to self-selection by ability, with stronger students grouping together and leaving weaker students to struggle behind (Oakley, 2004, De Vita, 2001). This can be a particularly pertinent issue in diverse classes where language ability may form a significant barrier for some students to show their true academic potential.

There is little strong evidence pointing one way or another. Hilton and Phillips (2010) conducted a case study where student-selected groups perceived themselves to do better but when grades were measured, the actual grades of the group projects did not differ between group formation conditions.

Action: Given the wider objective of achieving social and academic integration in this diverse student group, the first approach was chosen. An online tool was set up which allowed students to add their name to a particular group. These groups were organized by topic, with the intention to avoid grouping students by nationality or by friendship group, acknowledging that in practice nationality and friendship groups frequently coincide.

Observation: The vast majority of the students did not use this opportunity to opt into multi-national, topic based groups. When asked why they did not use this opportunity, some of the answers hinted at a problem:

“I want to be with my friends” (multiple comments from Chinese, Middle Eastern, British and Irish students, both male and female)

“I don’t want to be with anyone who has not been here for the full three years” (British student, male)

“I am the only international student in this group. This is not fair” (Chinese student, male)

“I don’t want to have to work together with students from abroad. They don’t know how to reference. I got an unfair practice case because of this last year.” (British student, male)

Reflection

The low take up of group selection by topic coupled with a range of comments such as the above suggested that a different approach to group selection was needed.

Study 2 Cycle 2

Planning: At this point, there were three options to assign students to groups. Firstly to enforce randomized groups by topic, secondly to allow self-selection (as the original approach had not worked) or finally to attempt to combine the two.

Action: The action chosen in this case was to combine the two group formation strategies and to assign students to groups by nationality/friendship group and topic wherever possible in order to retain at least an element of the topic based approach but also allow for friendship groups. In this way, 20 tutorial groups were formed, almost all of them separated by nationality.

Observation: After the allocation process, **only one** student out of 115 raised a concern, this one Chinese student asked to be put in a group with non-Chinese students (which he then did not attend). The student feedback throughout the module and at the end was very positive. An unintentional side effect that occurred was that by allowing students to be together with compatriots or friends, tutorial groups also reflected different ability/language levels, which the teaching team could address and thus support all students appropriately, rather than generically. The grades for this module were above the average of the cohort, suggesting that this tailored support made a difference.

Reflection: This process suggests that the students in this cohort (as in Study 1) felt no particular need for integration, on the contrary, they did not engage with attempts to introduce it. Whilst Study 1 was descriptive in nature, Study 2 included action and intervention with the aim of fostering integration. However the outcomes show that in this case, students **academically** benefited from groups that were based on nationality/friendship groups, and that they enjoyed the module. While in many ways the approach chosen could be deemed to have been successful, there is no doubt that on the **social and**

personal level the contribution of this module to Young et al's (2014) aims of encouraging domestic and international students to engage with each other in ongoing interaction, characterized by mutual respect, responsibility, action, and commitment has been limited.

Study 3

Planning: The context of this study was a small specialist Masters cohort. This group consisted of 25 students, of whom ten were British, seven Chinese, two French, 2 Mexican, one Kuwaiti, one Nigerian and two from Pakistan. Some of the British students had studied together before and were local, but not all.

Research objective: To integrate this very diverse group of students into a socially and academically well-functioning unit and create a mutually supportive learning environment and a supportive social environment for all students.

Action: Multiple actions were taken by several academic staff members and also the support staff in the School to facilitate the social and academic integration of this group. This began with interactive and team based induction activities, and was followed by an emphasis on interaction and group work in the individual modules. These actions were complimented by social events which encouraged social interaction, such as a bring-and-share lunch, where students brought and shared dishes from their home countries. Small group work on and off campus was strongly encouraged by all staff.

Observations: The teaching team and support staff closely observed both the academic and social progress of this group. By Christmas, the majority of the students in this group had become well integrated, to be precise, 18 of them. This group became known as the as 'the group that always walk around together' by the support staff in the university. They learned together, socialized with each other and visited each other's homes. However, there were two subgroups who opted out of this process. Four of the local British and three of the Chinese students did not take part in this process and retained separate friendship and study groups.

Reflection: The social and academic integration of this group was largely successful but it needed staff intervention. This was not a naturally occurring process but "an intentional process" (Young et al, 2014) that required a significant amount of staff input. An important aspect here is also to look at the students who chose to opt out of this process. Their characteristics confirm some of the barriers to integration identified in Study 1 – they were local British students with their own friendship groups and Chinese students, also with a large choice of other Chinese students within the university and wider locale.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This series of studies has identified a number of factors which facilitate integration of diverse students groups. Facilitating factors are small group size, lack of access to compatriots for the majority of students and sufficient staff time and resources to create an intentional process. Integration does not seem to happen organically but if it is to be achieved successfully, it needs to be a planned, intentional process, in line with Young et al's (2014) definition. The expectation that integration happens organically by placing students into a heterogeneous environment seem to be misplaced. Study 1 and 2 are reflections of this scenario, with large multi-national groups in which students study and socialize alongside each other, but not with each other. It appears that it is not just interactions, but the quality of the interaction between student groups that determines successful integration (Dejaeghere et al, 2012).

Factors impacting on the quality of these interactions appear to be group size and composition are key factors in the success of student integration. Studying in a multi-national group by itself does not create integration, and, as the first two studies show, is often resisted by students. It could also be argued that in some circumstances integration may not be the best option academically, because allowing students to self-select into groups of their own choosing (which is often along nationality lines) allows a more tailored teaching approach. This ties in with Rienties' et al (2012) research who found that study

performance and social integration of non-western students were negatively related which implies that the wider personal and social benefits of an integrated international study experience do not necessarily translate into successful academic performance. Instead it appears to be successful academic adjustment which determines study performance especially of non-Western students (Rienties et al, 2014). This, in turn, could be supported with a tailored teaching style as used in Study 2.

In both Study 1 and Study 2, (and to a lesser extent in Study 3) three factors stood out as barriers to academic and social integration. The first one is a situation where the majority of domestic students come from the local area, they retain their friendship network and simply have no need to expand the effort to engage with international students. Secondly, integration is less likely if there are large groups of international students from the same country – similar to local students, there is no immediate need to make the effort to study or socialize with domestic students. Finally, a lack of resources to actively facilitate integration in multiple ways. Successful integration needs to address the fears and ethnocentrism of the domestic students and address their unwillingness to work with international students as well as the insecurities and communication issues of the international students. In her recent research Wilkie maintains that the integration of international students requires a ‘campuswide effort involving faculty, academic departments, and domestic students’ (Wilkie, 2016, p.44) and in line with this, this paper suggests that international student integration is more likely to be successful if a holistic team based approach with a high level of intervention is chosen (as in Study 3) which includes looking at issues such as the size of lectures, composition of study groups, planning of induction and social events, and which is not based on individual modules, programmes or separate events.

The study used samples from two different universities located in Wales, UK. The student cohorts appear to be fairly typical for UK universities but it is possible that home student cohorts were more local than those of other UK universities, as both of these universities draw the majority of their domestic students from within a 100 mile radius. This could have affected the results and is an issue that could be explored further in additional studies.

Furthermore, an interesting addition to the existing research would be to collect more detailed evidence of students’ opinions on the desirability and effectiveness of academic and social integration, perhaps using focus groups. This approach was rejected as a first or primary research method but as a follow up project, focus groups could be presented with the current results and be asked to which extent the results tally with their experience. Further action research projects could be used to assess the success of different interventions into the integration process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to and acknowledges the help of the Marketing teaching teams at Swansea University and the Business and Marketing team at the University of Wales Trinity Saint David. Without the help of my colleagues at both universities this paper would not have been written.

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Academy of Marketing Conference, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom, 4-7th July 2016.

REFERENCES

- Bøe, L. & Hurley, D. (2015). *Gone international: Mobile students and their outcomes report on the 2012/13 graduating cohort*. Higher Education International Unit.
<http://go.international.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Gone%20International%20mobile%20students%20and%20their%20outcomes.pdf>.
- British Council (2014). *Integration of international students: A UK Perspective*. British Council
<https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/oth-integration-report-september-14.pdf>
- Canadian Bureau of International Education (CBIE) (2016). *Facts and figures*. <http://cbie.ca/media/facts-and-figures>.

- Chapman, K. J., Meuter, M., Toy, D., & Wright, L. (2006). Can't we pick our own groups? The influence of group selection method on group dynamics and outcomes. *Journal of Management Education*, 30(4), 557-569.
- COBE (2005). *Action research: A guide for associate lecturers*. <http://www.open.ac.uk/cobe/docs/AR-Guide-final.pdf>.
- Cockrill, A. and Harris, N. (2015). Learner profiles at a UK university: An exploratory study. In *Academy of Marketing Conference Proceedings*, Limerick, July 2015.
- Dejaeghere, Y., Hooghe, M. and Claes, E. (2012) Do ethnically diverse schools reduce ethnocentrism? A two-year panel study among majority group late adolescents in Belgian schools. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36, 108-117.
- De Vita, G. (2001) The use of group work in large and diverse Business Management classes: Some critical issues. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 1(3),27-35.
- Harrison, N. & Peacock, N. (2010) Cultural distance, mindfulness and passive xenophobia: using Integrated Threat Theory to explore home higher education students' perspectives on 'internationalization at home'. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(6), 877– 902.
- Harrison, N. (2012). Understanding the domestic student role in integration: Mindfulness, cultural exposure, and early life experiences. Presentation at Integrating International Students: A Symposium, Singapore City, Singapore.
- Hilton, S. & Phillips, F. (2010). Instructor-assigned and student-selected groups: A view from the inside. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 25 (1), 15-33.
- ICEF (2015) *The state of international student mobility in 2015* <http://monitor.icef.com/2015/11/the-state-of-international-student-mobility-in-2015/>.
- Jones, E. (2009). *Internationalization and the student voice: Higher education perspectives*. Routledge.
- Lee, J.J. & Rice, Charles (2007) Welcome to America? Institutional student perceptions of discrimination. *Higher Education* 53 (3), 381-409.
- McNamara, K. & Skorka, I. (2007). Social integration of international students: Encouraging the formation of friendships with local students in the mainstream secondary school context. In *Proceedings of the ISANA International Conference Student Success in International Education*, 27-30 November, Stamford Grand, Glenelg, Adelaide, Australia.
- McNiff, J. (2002) *Action research for professional development: Concise advice for new researchers*. 3rd ed <http://www.jeanmcniff.com/ar-booklet.asp>.
- Myers, S. A. (2011). Students' perceptions of classroom group work as a function of group member selection. *Communication Teacher*, 26(1), 50-64.
- Oakley, B., Felder, R.M. & Elhajj, R.B.I. (2004). Turning student groups into effective teams. *Journal of Student Centered Learning*, 2(1), 9- 34.
- Owens, A.R. & Loomes, S.L. (2010). Managing and resourcing a program of social integration initiatives for international university students: what are the benefits? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 32(3), 275–290.
- Pine, G. (2009). *Teacher action research: Building knowledge democracies*. Sage.
- Rienties, B., Grohnert, T., Kommers, P., S. Niemantsverdriet & Nijhuis, J. (2011). Rienties, Bart; Grohnert, Therese; Kommers, Piet; Niemantsverdriet, Susan and Nijhuis, Academic and social integration of international and local students at five business schools, a cross-institutional comparison. In: Van den Bossche, P.; Gijsselaers, W.H. and Milter, R.G. eds. *Building learning experiences in a changing world. Advances in Business Education and Training* (3). Dordrecht: Springer, 121–137.
- Rienties, B., Beusaert, S, Grohnert, T., Niemantsverdriet, S. & Kommers, P.A.M. (2012). Understanding academic performance of international students: the role of ethnicity, academic and social integration. *Higher Education*, 63(6), 685 – 700.
- Rienties, B., Alcott, P. & Jindal-Snape, D. (2014). To let students self-select or not: that is the question for teachers of culturally diverse groups. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18(1), 64–83.

- Rienties, B., Luchoomun, D. & Tempelaar, D. (2014). Academic and social integration of Master students: a cross-institutional comparison between Dutch and international students. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 51(2), 130–141.
- Sagor, R. (2000) *Guiding School Improvement with Action Research*.
<http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/100047.aspx>
- Scott, Colin; Safdar, Saba; Desai Trilokekar, Roopa; and El Masri, Amira (2015) "International Students as 'Ideal Immigrants' in Canada: A disconnect between policy makers' assumptions and the lived experiences of international students," *Comparative and International Education / Éducation Comparée et Internationale*: Vol. 43: Iss. 3, Article 5. Available at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cie-eci/vol43/iss3/5>
- Smith, M. K. (1996; 2001, 2007) 'Action research', *the encyclopedia of informal education*.
<http://infed.org/mobi/action-research/>.
- Spencer-Oatey, H., Dauber, D. & Williams, S. (2014). *Promoting integration on campus: Principles, practice and issues for further exploration*, UKCISA, <http://www.i-graduate.org/assets/Warwick.pdf>
- Sovic, S. (2009) Hi-Bye friends and the herd instinct: international and home students in the creative arts. *Higher Education* 58(6), 747-761.
- Summers, M. & Volet, S. (2008) Students' attitudes towards culturally mixed groups on international campuses: impact of participation in diverse and non-diverse groups. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(4), 357-370.
- Sullivan, C. & Kashubeck-West, S. (2015). The interplay of international students' acculturative stress, social support, and acculturation modes. *Journal of International Students* 5(1), 1-11.
- Turner, Y. (2006). Chinese students in a UK Business School: Hearing the student voice in reflective teaching and learning practice. *Higher Education Quarterly* 60(1), 27-51.
- UKISCA (2017). *International Student Statistics: UK Higher Education*
<https://institutions.ukcisa.org.uk/Info-for-universities-colleges--schools/Policy-research--statistics/Research--statistics/International-students-in-UK-HE/>
- UNESCO (2016). *Global Flow of Tertiary Level Students*.
<http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Pages/international-student-flow-viz.aspx>.
- Ward, C. (2001). *The Impact of International Students on Domestic Students and Host Institutions*. University of Victoria.
https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/international/the_impact_of_international_students_on_domestic_students_and_host_institutions..
- Wilkie, D. (2016). Assessment 101: Measuring the success of international student integration. *International Educator*, 25(5), 44-47.
- Xia, R. (2016). Number of international students in U.S. colleges at an all-time high, and California is their top destination, *Los Angeles Times*, Nov 25, 2016.
- Young, N.E., Kappler, B., Woodruff, G., Eland, A., Isemsee, B., Yefanova, D. & Yu, X. (2014). *Seeking best practices for integrating international and domestic students research and analysis*. University of Minnesota: ISSS
https://global.umn.edu/icc/documents/14_integration_best_practices_overall.pdf
- Zhang, Z. & Brunton M. Differences in living and learning: Chinese international students in New Zealand, *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11(2), 124-140.

APPENDIX A - QUESTIONS STUDY 1

How often do you study with (other) international students?
How often do you talk to (other) international students?
How often do you do things socially with (other) international students?
How often do you study with (other) British students?
How often do you do talk to (other) British students?
How often do you do things socially with (other) British students?

APPENDIX B - DEMOGRAPHICS STUDY 1, N=189

Gender	47% Male	52% Female	
Age*	50% 18-21 years old	44% 22-25 years old	6% older
Study Level	38% Level 4	15% Level 6	46% Level 7
Nationality*	42% British (79 students)	40% Chinese (76 students)	20% Other
Length of stay in the UK*	29% Less than a year in the UK	27% 1-5 years in the UK 3% 6-15 years in the UK	41% all life in UK

APPENDIX C – T-TESTS AND CHI-SQUARE RESULTS

Independent Samples T -test British versus non British students

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Study with international students	Equal variances assumed	.031	.860	7.904	179	.000	1.03145	.13050
	Equal variances not assumed			7.883	160.158	.000	1.03145	.13085
Talk to international students	Equal variances assumed	.079	.779	5.818	179	.000	.73822	.12688
	Equal variances not assumed			5.819	161.803	.000	.73822	.12687
Do social things with international students	Equal variances assumed	.010	.920	6.960	178	.000	.93067	.13372
	Equal variances not assumed			6.868	153.460	.000	.93067	.13552
Study with British students	Equal variances assumed	.281	.597	-9.819	178	.000	-1.27733	.13009
	Equal variances not assumed			-9.998	171.107	.000	-1.27733	.12776
Talk to British students	Equal variances assumed	19.648	.000	-10.814	179	.000	-1.29599	.11985
	Equal variances not assumed			-11.521	177.639	.000	-1.29599	.11249
Do social things with British students	Equal variances assumed	5.258	.023	-12.188	179	.000	-1.51729	.12449
	Equal variances not assumed			-12.736	178.642	.000	-1.51729	.11914

Crosstabs with Chi-Squares

	<i>Study with international students</i>				Total
	Never = 1.00	2.00	3.00	Always = 4.00	
Non British	9	34	44	18	105
	8.6%	32.4%	41.9%	17.1%	100.0%
British	42	24	5	5	76
	55.3%	31.6%	6.6%	6.6%	100.0%
Total	51	58	49	23	181
	28.2%	32.0%	27.1%	12.7%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	58.316	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	63.668	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	46.568	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	181		

	<i>Talk to international students</i>				Total
	Never = 1.00	2.00	3.00	Always = 4.00	
Non British	3	30	40	32	105
	2.9%	28.6%	38.1%	30.5%	100.0%
British	15	34	22	5	76
	19.7%	44.7%	28.9%	6.6%	100.0%
Total	18	64	62	37	181
	9.9%	35.4%	34.3%	20.4%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.284	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	31.605	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	28.628	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	181		

	<i>Do social things with international students</i>				Total
	Never = 1.00	2.00	3.00	Always = 4.00	
Non British	4	41	35	24	104
	3.8%	39.4%	33.7%	23.1%	100.0%
British	34	27	9	6	76
	44.7%	35.5%	11.8%	7.9%	100.0%
Total	38	68	44	30	180
	21.1%	37.8%	24.4%	16.7%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	49.574 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	53.613	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	38.290	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	180		

	<i>Talk to British students</i>				Total
	Never = 1.00	2.00	3.00	Always = 4.00	
Non British	19	41	33	12	105
	18.1%	39.0%	31.4%	11.4%	100.0%
British	0	5	16	55	76
	0.0%	6.6%	21.1%	72.4%	100.0%
Total	19	46	49	67	181
	10.5%	25.4%	27.1%	37.0%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	78.025	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	89.735	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	71.125	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	181		

	<i>Study with British students</i>				Total
	Never = 1.00	2.00	3.00	Always = 4.00	
Non British	34	38	26	6	104
	32.7%	36.5%	25.0%	5.8%	100.0%
British	3	7	29	37	76
	3.9%	9.2%	38.2%	48.7%	100.0%
Total	37	45	55	43	180
	20.6%	25.0%	30.6%	23.9%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	67.109 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	74.599	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	62.891	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	180		

	<i>Do social things with British students</i>				Total
	Never = 1.00	2.00	3.00	Always = 4.00	
Non British	29	44	23	9	105
	27.6%	41.9%	21.9%	8.6%	100.0%
British	2	3	16	55	76
	2.6%	3.9%	21.1%	72.4%	100.0%
Total	31	47	39	64	181
	17.1%	26.0%	21.5%	35.4%	100.0%

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	91.298 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	104.325	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	81.630	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	181		