

Developing relationality and student belonging: the need for building cosmopolitan engagement in undergraduate communities

Dr Jan Bamford
London Metropolitan University
84 Moorgate
London EC2M 6SQ
j.bamford@londonmet.ac.uk

Dr Lucie Pollard
Director of London Campus,
University of the West of Scotland,
Lucie.pollard@uws.ac.uk

Notes on contributors

Jan Bamford is Head of Student Experience and Academic Outcomes at London Metropolitan University and has been a Principal Fellow of the Higher Education Academy since 2014. Her research interests are focused around the experience of cultural diversity in the classroom and internationalising the curriculum.

Lucie Pollard was Faculty Operating Officer in the Faculty of Education at the University of Greenwich. Lucie has recently taken up a post as Director of the University of the West of Scotland's campus in London. Her research interests are on cultural diversity and laddism in higher education.

Key words: cultural plurality; cosmopolitan engagement; relationality; student belonging; commuter students

Abstract

This paper addresses evidence that developing a sense of belonging for students from different ethnic groups impacts on their engagement. It notes previous findings that in universities habits of coexistence may present barriers to the development of relationships and the sense of student belonging. The paper proposes that cosmopolitan engagement offers a frame for considering the experience of cultural difference in the classroom. It stresses the importance of relationality and communication. The research, involving students undertaking business and science programmes in two culturally similar post-92 London universities, sought to develop a better understanding of how students in London engage with higher education, their learning and with cultural others and the impact on their learning of differing communication patterns. The study finds that students often feel distant from their tutors and afraid to ask for further explanation. Instead, they rely on a circle of friends to provide support and clarification. Students identified the development of agency through engaging with others from different cultures. Engagement in practical collective tasks such as forensic lab work seems to have the potential to encourage communication across cultures, but observation suggested that the students tended to self-segregate. The article concludes that there cannot be a presumption of cosmopolitan engagement. Rather universities need to develop strategies for improving

communication between students and staff and between students of different cultural backgrounds.

Introduction

Student belonging has become a defining term in higher education (Tinto, 1975, Pokorny et al, 2016) that is nuanced by the differing cultural backgrounds of students and the importance of relationships. This paper explores the context of the relational experience and the potential for the development of belonging for communities of culturally diverse commuter students in urban universities.¹ The concern around the diversity of the student body in urban classrooms and the potential differential outcomes in the performance of ethnic minority groups is not new. However, the current discourse demands further exploration in the context of how relationships develop and influence that student belonging and the student experience, and where cultural difference might be regarded as a key aspect of those relationships. The work of Mountford-Zimdars et al (2015) identifies that developing a sense of belonging for students from different ethnic groups impacts on performance. The literature suggests that there are habits of coexistence in evidence in the higher education classroom, which present barriers to the development of relationships and the sense of student belonging (Pokorny et al, 2016). This research allowed for an exploration of the parameters encountered by individual students in higher education that

¹ Commuter students are defined as those who are living in the family home and who commute to a city based university to attend lectures, see; <http://www.independent.co.uk/student/student-life/more-students-choosing-to-live-at-home-and-commute-to-save-costs-a7549981.htm>

involved potential contact with 'others' from different backgrounds and the development of an understanding of the barriers to learning.

This paper aims to explore further students' responses to uncertainty, responsibility and relations with others in a context of the potential impact of differing communication patterns. Welikala and Watkins (2008), Trahar (2011), and Killick (2015) all point to a need for higher education institutions to refocus their approach to curriculum delivery in order to create a cosmopolitan engagement (Delanty and He, 2008, Bamford et al, 2015) that enables the building of relationships within a culturally diverse student body and facilitating the bridging of potential cultural barriers. Khan (2014) identifies relations with others as a factor in understanding engagement. The focus on a cosmopolitan engagement offers a frame for considering the experience of cultural difference in the classroom, the importance of relationality and communication. Mountford-Zimdars et al's (2015) research on differential outcomes for those students from differing ethnic backgrounds may be linked to the literature on understanding the impact of cultural difference in higher education.

The intention is to develop an understanding of the impact, if any, of the students' differing cultural backgrounds and their communication patterns. These communication patterns can be seen to influence students' relationships with each other; Welikala and Watkins (2008) talk of differing cultural scripts in the classroom, which influence individuals' communication and learning patterns. In order to understand the communication between students from different cultural backgrounds, we have drawn on Geertz's

(1973) view of culture as being the 'fabric of meaning' for individuals (Geertz 1973), and the way they make sense of their lives. This includes the values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours that may influence students' communication and learning in the classroom. It is acknowledged that the definition of culture and its relationship with ethnic identities is a necessarily complex and contested field, and we have focused here on the difference in communication patterns that impact students' learning in a culturally heterogeneous environment. The classroom experience was the particular focus for this study due to the commuter element of the urban campus, although it is acknowledged that communication across cultures within the student body takes place and relationships are built in many other fora.

The higher education context as framed by culture

Although there has been a substantial amount of research in relation to the international student experience of UK higher education (Bamford, 2008; Bamford et al, 2006; Carroll & Ryan, 2006; Cortazzi & Jin, 1997; De Vita, 2001; Haigh, 2009, Jin and Cortazzi, 2016 to name a few) there has been little work undertaken which looks at the culturally diverse classroom. Phakiti *et al* (2013), and Wright and Schartner (2013) found that international students engaged less, not simply because of the language barriers, but also because of cultural nuances that affected motivation and independent learning. This suggests that for a significant group of students the transmutation of the 'will to learn' (Barnett, 2007) into an educational outcome is in doubt.

This research draws on such work with international students with regard to strategies and approaches to facilitate cultural interactions, applying the

approaches for international students to those defined as 'home' students, who in the institutions in this study are identified as second and third generation migrants. In other words, there is a need for a similar approach to the one advocated for internationally culturally diverse classrooms by Arkoudis et al (2013); that is the establishment of a common ground for communication amongst the student group even if the student group is not defined as international.

Thus there has been considerable focus on the international student experience but little work has been carried out on the implications of the changing demographics of 'home' students. While the potential artificiality of the term 'home' is acknowledged (Holliday, 2016), the notion of 'home' is used here to identify the difference between those students already resident in the UK, including many European students, and those who entered the UK for the purposes of pursuing their education.

The diversity of this home undergraduate population reflects the changing demographics of urban communities, particularly London (BBC News 2015): the implications of the growing migrant population is certainly subject to much debate, but the impact of differing communication patterns in the classroom still needs further analysis. The cultural shaping of the self has been argued by Matthews (2000), for example, to exist at a number of levels and the cognition of the cultural self might be perceived as challenging. For Matthews (2000) rules and norms of behaviour are defined from cultural codes. These codes may be tacit and the most affecting level of cultural knowledge is unknowable for many because we think in the language of our culture. We

therefore cannot easily be reflexive with regard to how that language shapes our thinking. For example, to reflect on our own nuances of behaviour and intonations of language, is a challenge: our *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1977), is largely taken for granted and steeped in our social and cultural practice. Does an increasingly diverse 'home' population have the implicit skills to negotiate its culturally plural learning environment and engage in active participation in their education?

It could be argued that dissonance can arise in culturally diverse classrooms (Bamford, 2014, Bickel and Jensen, 2012) which can result in an unequal educational experience and low achievement rates for some (Mountford-Zimdars et al, 2015) . The importance of the classroom environment to intercultural development is acknowledged by Lee et al (2014). The diverse classroom provides opportunities for the lived experience of cultural difference. Lee et al's (2014) study evidences that well-managed classroom interactions can increase students' confidence with their intercultural interactions. The documented unevenness of achievement rates amongst student groups (Mountford-Zimdars et al, 2015) points to a need for universities to understand further the complexities involved in improving student outcomes for culturally diverse student bodies and perhaps engage in a more dialogic approach to cultural difference (Trahar, 2011, Bamford, 2014). Those institutions that adopt a learning approach that draws on students' differing cultural backgrounds to enhance the learning experience and the development of transferable skills, position themselves to lead the way in teaching excellence, Mountford-Zimdars et al' (2015).

What is Cosmopolitan Engagement?

A construct of cosmopolitanism as an ethos and as a value embedded in the curriculum might be viewed as an appropriate approach to dissonance and the lack of belonging. This dissonance may arise as a result of differences in language and communication patterns that are culturally determined, and where the space for developing understanding is limited by time and environment. Appiah (2006) emphasises that cosmopolitanism is not a new concept, with its origins and etymology stemming from the Stoics and the Greek word *cosmopolites*: the idea of being a citizen of the world or cosmos. This emphasis on our common humanity refocuses the potential for cultural difference to create opportunities for additional learning and the development of belonging. The higher education environment should provide a natural forum for differences in communication patterns to be addressed and incorporated into the learning construct. In theory then, it could be argued that an opportunity for communication between cultural others is presented, because the cultural classroom offers a learning community that bridges potential barriers. In other words, a sense of 'being' in relation to accepting and understanding others' differing cultural values; and a relational context that is underpinned by a notion of being a citizen of the world, a value of common humanity if you will.

An emphasis on the need for a human community and for developing "habits of coexistence" (Appiah, 2006:xvii) is acknowledged by researchers such as Rizvi, (2009) as central to the learning environment. However, there appears to be insufficient discussion or acknowledgment placed on the development of

our cultural capital and cultural knowledge as part of the higher education process.

Through an acknowledgement and understanding of the influences on students' active participation in culturally diverse classrooms we can move the debate forward. Kahn (2014) and Trowler (2015) recognise that there is variation in engagement at the level of the individual, and the globalised education environment brings multiple layers of identity for individuals to the forefront of the learning experience (Rizvi, 2009).

The question posed, in relation to student engagement and cultural diversity, was whether universities need to do more to encourage engagement in culturally diverse contexts, and across culturally different groups in urban environments.

Methodology

The research, funded by the Higher Education Academy, sought to develop a better understanding of how students in London engage with higher education, their learning and with cultural others and the impact on their learning of differing communication patterns. The research was carried out at two culturally similar post-²1992 London universities, and sampled students undertaking business and science programmes. The cross-disciplinary and cross-institutional nature of the project builds on existing work on cultural diversity in the classroom.

² The term is synonymous with institutions that were former polytechnics which were awarded university in 1992.

The demographics of the students were similar at both institutions with 58% considering themselves as white, with the next largest ethnic group being 12% who identified themselves as black British. In terms of a self-identification of ethnicity, 44% identified themselves as international or European and only 30% of respondents had a parent born in the UK.

We collected data via participant observations, gathering visual data and field notes over a period of a month at each institution and convening ten focus group interviews with a total of 92 participants overall across the two research sites. The sample was a representative sample consisting of students, including European students, from all academic levels and across all undergraduate courses at both institutions. The focus group interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview approach, with students being encouraged to engage in a dialogue about their experience to allow for a rich and in-depth picture to unfold. The analysis of the data focused on understanding the students' experience of difference and non-difference in the classroom, their relationality and the development of their communication with each other. The data were analysed through a thematic analysis framework (Richie et al, 2003) with categories and themes being drawn from the literature, and the reading and rereading of transcripts. This approach permitted the researchers to distil the substantive themes and develop a matrix grid for analysis. Through this thematic analysis approach an understanding of students' challenges with and experience of diversity and differing communication patterns and similarities was developed. A picture of the students' perspective of their learning and the relationships that framed that learning was developed.

In addition to focus group interviews, observations of classroom engagement were undertaken by both researchers at each research site over a period of a month. A broad range of classes was observed at each degree level and across different degree subjects. Field notes were taken, drawings made of classrooms and photographic evidence taken of classroom dynamics and interactions. The data were shared and themes drawn up by each member of the research team, then compared and refined. The themes that were emergent from the data centred around cultural difference, community, social space, group communication, the bridging of cultural barriers and barriers to participation. Ethics approval followed standard BERA guidelines, and the anonymity of participants was maintained.

Discussion

The data provided evidence of potential barriers to relationality, and a lack of participation in social groups as well as frustration with others. These barriers and boundaries were not always culturally steeped as the findings suggest that the higher education culture can carry expectations that are often not clearly expressed by institutions and are hence difficult to adjust to. This echoes Thomas' (2002) notion of the persistence of an institutional habitus that many students find difficult to transition to. The somewhat rarefied language of higher education also resulted in a distancing effect.

This is evidenced in the following first year response to questions about lecturers' communication styles:

...If I've got to be really honest some tutors are really friendly and I like this, because I need it...So I can express more and more. I can ask more questions, more explanations, And there was some tutors, they take you really professionally...and they always keep that distance

between me and them and sometimes when I'm stuck I just can't ask them, I just shake my head: Yes, yes, I understand. (Focus group 2)

These barriers to communication were evidenced in the learning environment between staff and students, that is, an acknowledgement of a lack of understanding of a point being made and confirmation of a failure to express this lack of understanding of the communication. Observations confirmed the existence of these barriers. The focus groups confirmed that students often felt distant from their tutors and afraid to ask them to either repeat a point made in class or to provide a further explanation. For the students it was their circle of friends, and those with whom they developed a close relationship, that provided support and clarification.

The barriers to learning appeared impactful if relationships with others were not developed. Relationships appeared to be formed early in the students' studies which highlight the importance of Induction Week or early social activities that enable a community to develop. The following excerpts provide insights into the importance of community for the students in this study:

I have the feeling, when you go to a lecture everyone is sitting in the same place, talking to the same people and they don't really talk to people beyond that group, they seem not interested because they are not their friends (Student A, Focus Group 10).

...for me it is important to get to know people...what should I do, should I go and ask everyone and ask them which degree they are doing...So I did that, I did that all by myself, I didn't even know who my tutor was. I had to run behind these things and there was no one and no space for interaction (Student, Focus Group 10).

For Lab work ...I chose some people and I work with the same people. (Student C, Focus Group 10).

These informal networks and communities were a common feature and were evidenced throughout the interviews and reinforced the distancing effect in terms of the wider learning community: for these students the immediate

community was the only one of importance. The data evidenced that the formation and reliance on early relationships can be seen as a feature of the commuter student. Some commented that they felt that fellow students only cared about themselves and they found this difficult to cope with where these relationships had not formed.

A relational dynamic, distributed agency and a sense of belonging

Two common themes that emerged from the focus groups were relationships and the development of agency through engaging with others from different cultures. Learning together with students from different cultures was a very positive experience that brought students closer together.

Mm, I love it! It is one of the reasons I am in London! Because I love diversity, I love to interact with other group! Saying that, I see some people, you know: they don't like to interact with another group. So, you see for example, one ethnicity group with another, one group with another and then... the odd ones (laughing). I'm the odd one - the Latino group, you know. You move from one group to another. But, honestly, Germans, they stick with the Germans. And if you do an assignment with the German people they will speak with you in German (*laughing*). Because I remember, I did an assignment with the Germans and they would only speak German. And I would speak German by the end of the assignment (laughing), you know, because... 'Yeah, yeah, I agree with you, - Ya, ya!' Because some people, you know, but I think... Because me, I believe you have to mix, interact with everyone, because otherwise you miss out! So I try to get involved with everyone. I don't care. You know, sometime I just come to the group, they sit there ... You know. But, saying that, it is quite divided. People would only stick to their own ethnicity I found out...which I don't like. I like people mixing with each other. Because we would learn more from each other. If we actually spent more time talking with each other. We can resolve so many issues just by talking with each other...(Focus Group 4)

This excerpt provides evidence of one particular student who recognised the importance of communication and differing communication patterns and the potential disruption to learning as a consequence of cultural barriers; that cooperation with others can be a facet of the learning environment and

cultural barriers needed to be crossed. There is a reflexive tone with regard to traversing cultural boundaries as well as a demonstration that knowledge acquisition could be acquired through a relational paradigm – that other students are a source of learning. The acknowledgement that others could be a source of learning was threaded throughout the interviews with this excerpt offering the clearest example of what appears to be evidencing the common humanity which forms the basis for cosmopolitan engagement. The respondent refers to herself as the ‘odd one’, underlining her separation from the German students to whom she makes reference. There is also recognition that the cosmopolitan environment of London generates the potential for cultural fluencies, which this student views as part of her education, expressing the view that not mixing with others would result in a lack of engagement for her.

Bridging barriers and listening to the student voice

Awareness of the complexity of the human condition that may arise from contemporary pluralities can, as Nixon (2013) asserts, lead to a sense of powerlessness and a loss of agency. Nixon asks what are the relational conditions necessary for the development of human understanding in pluralistic societies. This focus on building understanding is important in the context of encouraging a will to learn (Barnett 2007), in an environment where there are challenges to the communication with others: overcoming these challenges are part of becoming a student within a diverse classroom. The will to learn is a fundamental dynamic of the learning process, and yet some students in their first year of study alluded to the dissonance that arises and expressed this challenge in a negative way:

Yeah, I have such a problem...with the culture... It terrifies me, to be honest. I don't know, if it's me like my...perception of this. (Focus Group 6)

This excerpt demonstrates a common theme arising from the focus groups, that many students felt they were not equipped to deal with or address the cultural differences that they encountered. The powerlessness and loss of agency alluded to by Nixon (2013) was also a theme of the classroom observations. Nixon refers to higher education playing an important role in securing the future of cosmopolitanism but the evidence from the data from this study demonstrated that there cannot be a presumption of cosmopolitan engagement. The ability to understand difference and the tools needed to develop relationality between groups, points to the need for institutions to consider focusing on building the undergraduate community in a more concrete way, thus permitting the development of agency.

The need for cosmopolitan engagement is promulgated around a notion that students need to develop the skills to bridge barriers with different cultural groupings in order to negotiate the classroom environment. Echoing Mountford-Zimdars et al's work (2015), enhancing communication, together with the social and cultural cohesion between peer groups, would appear to enhance student belonging and thus student outcomes.

Adding further weight to the proposition that there is a need to contextualise engagement in a frame of cosmopolitanism is the link between engagement and outcomes for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. Mountford-Zimdars et al's (2015) report highlights the potentiality for differing outcomes of higher education for black and ethnic minority (BME) students.

Kezar (2014) supports a focus on the development of social networks which are taking on a stronger role within higher education. She argues that these social networks enable the flow of knowledge across the rigid boundaries often imposed by the curriculum and that this 'crossing' allows students to collectively take the 'risk' of changing their academic behaviours. Recognition of the benefits of such risk-taking is provided in the following excerpt:

But on the other hand, especially for us, I would say, it's better to have actually bigger class with more diversity, more different backgrounds, because it's not only working in a class, but also your network, which is probably the most important thing you gonna get from university. (Focus Group 10)

The importance of the social network is evidenced here and there is recognition that learning is participative and communicative and extends beyond the boundaries of the classroom.

Akkerman and Bakker (2011) carried out an empirical review of the literature around boundary crossing and found it enriched knowledge. However, they also found that it could leave people isolated on the periphery with the risk of not being accepted by the new community. Others (Handley et al, 2006) have also shown that while it is possible to encourage boundary crossing, it is difficult to sustain, as people are quick to revert back to their culturally familiar groupings. Both the benefit of taking a risk with communication and some reflection on reverting to culturally familiar groups are illustrated in the excerpt below:

...And it's important to be different. So I try to stick to M of Egypt, never changed, even when I went to live in France. Stick with my background, take these ideas, get in my head...Yes sometimes we need to be open-minded and this is what being in a different country push me to do...accept others ideas and even if I disagree with them...just accept it and yes we are still friends. In the old days when I

was in Egypt – no way! If you don't believe in the way I am thinking – no way, I am gonna listen to you! (Focus Group 1)

Again the potential for development and knowledge acquisition is demonstrated here in cultural terms. Lehmann (2007) has shown that first generation students, and particularly those from lower socio-economic groups, are more likely to leave university because they don't 'feel university'. Mountford-Zimdars et al (2015) note the importance of institutional interventions to boost students' sense of belonging and in building social and cultural capital, and thus enabling them to engage in higher education. They note that such positive interventions are important to address the differential outcomes of particular groups such as BME students; however, they require buy-in from professional services, students and academics.

The necessity of being part of a group was commented on by students in the focus group interviews. We asked students about the extent to which they felt they belonged and how they worked with other students:

.....and that definitely changes how you work in groups, and whether you are in a group with people you know or you don't know. So, even if you have, say, like high social skills, during the group with people you don't know, you feel uncomfortable with...and probably you are not gonna ask a lot of questions, try not to have a lot impact. It depends on surroundings, people you are working with and how comfortable you feel... (Focus Group 10)

Students tended to form groups around their shared experiences which were often defined by their culture or by their course, and by the engagement they had with others at the very start of their course. The excerpt below illustrates how groups are formed:

I mean, we are from the same school, we are friends, we hang out outside of this course and stuff like that and you discuss this very matter many-many times (Student A, Focus Group 6)

(I think) The people I work with, yeah, they are, and there is only one Scandinavian in my course, so it's always her and then the Central European ones and then the few British girls. Cos but then again, it's kind of neutral because we worked together on our first year. (Student B, Focus Group 6)

Where a student sits on the edge of the group, we witnessed that on occasions, this membership can be transient, but they still benefit from the shared learning.

The institutional role

The observational data evidenced clear differences in communication patterns in classrooms, together with patterns of behaviour that demonstrated distinct levels of engagement. High levels of engagement were observed in classes where the subjects studied employed a strong experiential element. This was most evident in laboratory work for those students studying forensic science: a classroom was converted into a crime scene with yellow danger tape and evidence of a crime which students had to solve collaboratively. These students were dressed as they would be for a 'real' crime scene (Figure 1) and exhibited visible relationality with a focus on the group task rather than their differences. The importance of real-world experience as a high impact pedagogical approach has been highlighted by Evans et al (2015). In our observations we witnessed that the separation based on the social dynamics of each group was not as palpable as in other classes. This was evidenced by the visual data:

**Figure 1: Forensic science students working on a collaborative task
February 2013**



This type of learning activity demonstrated the most engaged students: although groups were mixed both in terms of gender and cultural background, by being dressed in the same way the differences appeared to be dissolved. It can be seen as offering a learning environment that encourages cosmopolitanism and high levels of engagement, as well as evidencing the bridging of cultural barriers. These barriers appeared more easily overcome when there was a strong experiential element to the learning environment.

The pedagogical approach in both institutions and across all subjects revealed attempts by tutors to engage students through questions being posed in class; however, at neither institution was an attempt made to engage with the cultural plurality of the groups. In the business subjects the group work evidenced cultural challenges and potential stereotyping:

...for me putting lots of foreign people together is my worst nightmare because I am afraid of getting a panic attack because foreign people at a presentation together...just doesn't happen/work. (Focus Group 6)

This was not an isolated comment and offers evidence of the challenges that students have in understanding cultural others' communication patterns. It was one of the challenges to the learning environment that can be seen as culturally framed and suggested the need for more management of the process by tutors in order to breach the barriers that are presented.

There was little variation in pedagogy or evidence of culturally responsive approaches to culturally plural classrooms in either institution, even though the tutors themselves were from different cultural backgrounds. Whilst tutors demonstrated awareness of the cultural plurality of the classroom, there was concern expressed by the tutors that not enough was known about the effects on the classroom experience of students differing cultural backgrounds. It appeared that some tutors recognised that institutions were facing many challenges to improve equal opportunities for students and that higher education was due a cultural change.

Gay (2000) defines culturally responsive teaching as using cultural knowledge, prior experiences and the performance styles of diverse students to make learning more appropriate and effective for them; it teaches to and through the strengths of these students. The data from this study did not evidence culturally responsive teaching approaches; however, it did evidence students' awareness of the need to traverse cultural boundaries as well as their questioning the lack of support from their institutions in enabling such boundary crossing.

When asked about cultural differences in focus groups, the students admitted to forming friendships very early on in their course and that these initial groupings changed little during the course of their studies.

We take care of her but they don't...they don't consider ethnic or religious backgrounds... (Focus Group 10)

The students are referring to the institution and staff in the institution as 'they' in this excerpt. The statement reinforces the notion placed by students on the importance of friendships and care towards their fellow students.

Generally, the view that the university should be aware of and should consider the differences in students' backgrounds was clearly expressed in focus groups and was a theme of the interviews. Students felt little was done to aid them in traversing the barriers that they identified, other than universities offering a few activities at the start of their courses. Some of those initial activities led students to form groups or communities that lasted throughout their course.

Conclusions

Our study found that students from different cultural backgrounds appear motivated to engage at university but there is a lack of relationality amongst different groups, which we suggest affects their sense of belonging. Our findings evidenced that their habits of co-existence may present barriers to the development of their relationships in culturally plural environments and this in turn affects their engagement. We suggest that institutions need to do more to understand the ways in which the cultural make-up of their student bodies impact engagement and the need to facilitate students' relationality in order to enhance learning. The impact of culturally plural classrooms on engagement was, according to students, a widespread concern where a lack of communication with others in the classroom was apparent. Rather than

being imbued with an institutional or course identity, which facilitates active participation, some felt 'othered' and displayed a sense of separation.

This echoes the work of Holley et al's (2014) and Pokorny et al's (2016) who discuss the difficulties students from ethnic minority backgrounds have in developing a sense of belonging in a university environment where the commuter student comprises of the majority of the student body. Those who communicated across cultural barriers employed traversing skills and the findings suggest that institutions had not facilitated their navigating of different cultural groupings and their communication across these cultural groups.

The data from this study confirmed that students are unlikely to express their lack of understanding in class and that cultural difference increases the potential of non-engagement with the institution and potentially with peers. Others have also observed that students are placed at risk of not engaging when educators are careless in their approach to the issue of engagement (Quaye and Harper, 2015). The importance of high impact pedagogies that use 'real world' examples and simulations enabled stronger communication between students in this study, and has been highlighted by Evans et al (2015) as an effective approach to engaging students. Cosmopolitan engagement might therefore be viewed as a high impact pedagogical approach to the learning environment. It is suggested that institutions need to look at ways of establishing the sense of community amongst students both inside and outside the classroom. In order to encourage cosmopolitan engagement, communication across diverse groups of students needs to be

encouraged and activities that facilitate such communication embedded in the curriculum.

Field notes and visual data demonstrated that students tended to self-segregate into cultural and gender groups, particularly in science laboratories. This was commented on by students themselves in interviews. In business subjects we witnessed that group work could provide cultural learning, however, this appeared to be rarely intentional and it had the potential to result in negative as well as positive experiences and, in some cases, a potential for cultural stereotyping. The data suggests a 'distancing' effect between students rather than an educational environment that encourages relationality: an environment where the cultural plurality of the classroom reinforces the potential dissonance rather than exploiting the learning opportunities. The findings suggest that a lack of cultural engagement amongst students was prevalent and that this affected their engagement with their studies.

The data provided evidence of the need to focus on the existential parameters of higher education, recognising the potentiality of the heterogeneity of the engagement for individuals, whilst also acknowledging the challenges. The challenge can be met if attention is shifted to facilitate the relationality between students from different backgrounds, bridging barriers, and building resilience. This then encourages the will to learn, rather than the dissonance that may arise from a lack of understanding of different communication patterns. In essence, the ability to communicate with others, irrespective of cultural background and native language, can be seen as cosmopolitan engagement. It is argued that universities should attempt to address

students' differing communication patterns as part of the curriculum and recognise the impact on learning of the cultural pluralities of their student cohorts. The opportunities for enriching the learning experience, building on students' cultural differences and developing a cosmopolitan ethos appeared to be too easily overlooked.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the Higher Education Academy (HEA) for the award of a Teaching Development Grant in 2012, for a project looking at the internationalisation of higher education in the context of culturally diverse classrooms which supported this research.

References

- Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. London: Penguin.
- Arkoudis, S., Watty, K., Baik, C., Yu, X., Borland, H., Chang, S., et al. (2013). Finding common ground: enhancing interaction between domestic and international students in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(3), 222-235.
- Akkerman, S. F., & Bakker, A. (2011). Boundary crossing and boundary objects. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 132-169.
- Bamford, J., Marr, T., Pheiffer, G., & Weber-Newth, I. (2006). International Postgraduate Students in London: Some features of their expectation and experience. *Journal of Cyprus Sciences*, 4.
- Bamford, J. (2008). 'Strategies for the improvement of international students' academic and cultural experiences of studying in the UK'. Chapter 6, pp 158-67. In R. Atfield and P.Kemp, *Enhancing the International Learning Experience in Business and Management, Hospitality, Leisure, Sport, Tourism*. Newbury, Threshold Press.

Bamford, J. K. (2014). *Dealing with difference: developing an understanding of international postgraduate joint degree programmes in business in London and France*. (PhD Thesis), UCL Institute of Education, University of London.

Bamford, J., Djebbour, Y., Pollard, L., (2015). "I'll do this no matter if I have to fight the world!". *Journal for Multicultural Education*. Vol. 9 Iss 3 pp. 140 - 158.

Barnett, R. (2007). *A Will to Learn: Being a Student in an Age of Uncertainty*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press.

BBC News (2015). *London's population hits 8.6m record high* [online] Available at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-31082941>
Accessed on 18th April 2016

Bickel, G., & Jensen, D. (2012). Understanding cultural dissonance to enhance higher education academic success. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 66(1), 416-422.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Vol. 16): Cambridge University Press.

Carroll, J. and J. Ryan, Eds. (2006). *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All*. Staff and Educational Development Series. Abingdon, Routledge.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1997). Communication for learning across cultures. In D. McNamara & R. Harris (Eds.), *Overseas students in Higher Education: issues in teaching and learning*. London: Routledge.

De Vita, G. (2001). Learning Styles, culture and inclusive instruction in the multi-cultural classroom: a business and management perspective. *Innovations in Education and teaching International*, 38(2), 165-174.

Evans, C., Muijs, D., & Tomlinson, M. (2015). *Engaged student learning: High-impact strategies to enhance student achievement*. Higher Education Academy

Gay, G., (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, Research and Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures* (2000 ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Haigh, M. (2009). Fostering Cross-Cultural Empathy With Non-Western Curricular Structures. *Journal of Studies in International Higher Education*, 13(2), 271-284.

Handley, K., Sturdy, A., Fincham, R. and Clark, T., (2006). Within and beyond communities of practice: making sense of learning through participation, identity and practice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(3), 641-653.

Harrison, N., & Peacock, N. (2010). Cultural distance, mindfulness and passive xenophobia: using Integrated Threat Theory to explore home higher

- education students' perspectives on 'internationalisation at home'. *British Journal of Educational Research*, 38(6), 877-902.
- Holley, D., Kane, S., & Volpe, G. (2014). My First Ideal Day: Implications for induction from a three (London) university project. *Networks*, 17, 87-95.
- Holliday, A. (2016). PhD students, interculturality, reflexivity, community and internationalisation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*.
- Hills, J.M., Robertson, G., Walker, R., Adey, M.A. and , I., (2003). Bridging the gap between degree programme curricula and employability through implementation of work-related learning. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8(2), 211-231.
- Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2016). Practising cultures of learning in internationalising universities. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-14.
- Kahn, P. E. (2014). Theorising student engagement in higher education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 40(6), 1005-1018.
- Kezar, A., (2014). Higher education change and social networks: A review of research. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85(1), 91-125.
- Killick, D. (2015). *Developing the Global Student: Higher education in an era of globalization*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Land, R., (2013). 'Something at Stake.' Actively Engaging students for an uncertain world. *Centre for Enhanced Learning and Teaching Conference*. London Metropolitan University.
- Lee, A., Williams, R. D., Shaw, M. A., & Jie, Y. (2014). First-year students' perspectives on intercultural learning. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(5), 543-554.
- Lehmann, W. (2007). " I just didn't feel like I fit in": The role of habitus in university dropout decisions. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 37(2), .89-110.
- Matthews, G. (2000). *Global Culture/Individual Identity: Searching for home in the cultural supermarket*. London: Routledge.
- MacFarlane, B. (2015). Student performativity in higher education: converting learning as a private space into a public performance. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 34(2), 338-350
- Mountford-Zimdars, A., Duna, S., Moore, J., Sanders, J., Jones, S., & Higham, L. (2015). *Causes of differences in student outcomes*. Higher Education Funding Council for England. available at: http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/23653/1/HEFCE2015_diffout.pdf [last accessed: July 30 2015]
- Nixon, J. (2013). *Interpretive Pedagogies for Higher Education: Arendt, Berger, Said, Nussbaum and their Legacies*. London: Bloomsbury.

Phakiti A., Hirsh D., and Woodrow, L. (2013). It's not only English: Effects of other individual factors on English language learning and academic learning of ESL international students in Australia. *Journal of Research in International Education* 12: 239-258

Pokorny, H., Holley, D. & Kane, S. (2016) Commuting, transitions and belonging: the experiences of students living at home in their first year at university. *Higher Education* doi:10.1007/s10734-016-0063-3

Quaye, S.J., and Harper, S.R. (2015). *Student Engagement in Higher Education, Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge

Ritchie, J., Spencer, L., & O'connor, W. (2003). Carrying Out Qualitative Analysis. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage.

Rizvi, F. (2009). Towards cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 30:3, (3), 253-268.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89–125.

Trahar, S. (2011). *Developing Cultural Capability in International Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

Trowler, V. (2015). Negotiating Contestations and 'Chaotic Conceptions': Engaging 'Non-Traditional' Students in Higher Education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 69(3), 295–310.

Thomas, L., (2002) Student retention in higher education: the role of institutional habitus. *Journal of Education Policy* 17(4)

Vasagar, J. (2011). 'Black students say they feel left out by 'white cliques' at universities.' *The Observer Sunday May 22nd*.

Welikala, T. and Watkins, C. (2008). *Improving Intercultural Learning Experiences in Higher Education: Responding to Cultural Scripts for Learning*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E. (2011). *Communities of practice: A brief introduction*. Available online at: <https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/11736/A%20brief%20introduction%20to%20CoP.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>. [Last accessed: 12th August 2015]

Wright, C. and Schartner, A. (2013). 'I can't ... I won't?' International students at the threshold of social interaction. *Journal of Research in International Education* vol. 12:113-128

