AALL
Association for Academic
Language and Learning

Interaction for learning in the Anglophone university classroom: Mastering interactional challenges through reflective practice

Doris Dippold

School of English & Languages, University of Surrey, Guildford GU27XH (UK)

Email: d.dippold@surrey.ac.uk

In the internationalised classroom of the Anglophone world, tutors as well as students face the challenge of negotiating the norms of classroom interaction which frequently remain opaque, potentially leading to feelings of alienation and lost learning opportunities. After reviewing the literature on academic classroom talk in international and multilingual/multicultural settings, this paper uses episodes from one UK higher education classroom and the retrospective comments by the classroom tutor to discuss the challenges faced by students and tutors in today's "internationalised" Anglophone university. It ends by suggesting that the principle of "reflective practice", if implemented in staff development courses and in courses for all members of the classroom community, can train students to use spoken academic language more effectively in the internationalised Anglophone university. The paper further hopes to be able to bring together the discourses on internationalisation used in applied linguistics and education studies in the interest of more intensive collaboration between the two fields of research.

Key Words: Internationalisation, Anglophone universities, reflective practice, classroom interaction, international students.

1. Introduction

The internationalisation of higher education classrooms has been a focus of research in a number of academic disciplines, with applied linguistics and education studies being the most prominent contributors. Previous research, investigating tutors' as well as students' experiences of the internationalised university, shows that both groups can experience interactions in culturally diverse classrooms as a barrier to effective learning, leading to feelings of isolation and marginalisation. For instance, in a UK-based project on the internationalisation experiences of tutors and students (Hyland et al., 2008), one tutor is quoted as follows:

> They are usually very competent lecturers but they don't enjoy it. They really do not enjoy it. And it seems, "Oh, they don't understand what I'm saying, it takes so long to read through their work, they don't participate in class, when they say something I don't understand it." All of those barriers to effective engagement are part of that management issue, of how do you manage it. (p. 19)

Conversely, Welikala and Watkins (2008) quote a Kenyan student in the UK describing his puzzlement with the teacher-student relationships and, crucially, how it is enacted through language:

> Back home, we are free to ask questions from the teacher. But, never like this. We never just go on talking in the middle of the lesson … even if we disagree with the teacher, we will not argue with the teacher in the classroom. It is not nice. If we want to talk … we may meet him later … we may have the discipline thing in behaving with the teachers. If we argue like this, they will not like it … think that we are at them. (p. 17)

As Anglophone universities, I describe those located in countries where native varieties of English are being used, that is, those that form an "inner circle" (Kachru, 1992) of English speakers, such as the UK, Australia and the USA. However, universities in these countries also attract international students and staff from the "outer circle" (countries in which English is an institutional language, e.g. Nigeria, Bangladesh, Ghana) and the "expanding circle" (countries in which English is used and learned as a foreign language without being an institutional language). Most countries of central, southern and eastern Europe would belong to that circle.

Anglophone universities attract students from all three of these circles. Taking the UK as an example, the majority of both undergraduate (UG) and postgraduate (PG) students are still of UK origin. However, the student population from EU and non-EU countries is sizeable, as Table 1 shows. Particularly remarkable is the number of non-EU PG students.

Table 1: UK Student Population 2010-11 (Source: www.hesa.ac.uk).

	Undergraduate students	**Postgraduate students**
UK	1,698,040	375,030
Other EU	80,320	49,795
Non-EU	134,220	163,890

A "typical" UK classroom is therefore highly diverse, and it must not be forgotten that even home or UK students are by no means a homogenous cultural group. As Singh and Doherty (2008) point out, students rarely draw on only one national, class or ethnic identity. Rather, increased international mobility leads to more "liquid" and diverse identities. This is a situation replicated in other Anglophone countries. Using a case study approach, this paper will explore the challenges faced by both students and tutors in such diverse classrooms. It will draw on an interview conducted with a tutor from the "outer circle" of English speakers as well as extracts from a recording of one of his classes.

2. Classroom interaction at the Anglophone university

2.1. Classroom interactional competence

As this paper will conclude with recommendations for staff development of interactional competence in culturally diverse environments based on the notion of "reflective practice", I will frame my discussions with the notion of *classroom interactional competence* (CIC), introduced by Walsh (2011). CIC is defined as "teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning" (Walsh, 2011, p. 165). CIC consists of three components:

1. interactional strategies that heed the pedagogic goals of the classroom and that are appropriate to the needs of the learners
2. interactional strategies that facilitate the interactional space which learners require to participate in classroom talk and to get feedback
3. interactional strategies that shape learners' contributions (e.g. by seeking clarification, scaffolding, modelling, correction).

In describing the notion of *interactional competence,* Walsh emphasizes the joint responsibility of all conversation partners for establishing understanding: interactions are jointly managed and

listening / comprehension skills are as important as speaking skills for interactions to be successful. Moreover, the interactional resources required from the interlocutors will differ from context to context, therefore necessitating flexibility on behalf of interlocutors in adapting and adjusting their strategies.

2.2. International, multilingual, multicultural classrooms: Previous research

Researchers in both educational studies and applied linguistics have harboured an interest in "international" classrooms for many years. In applied linguistics, the earliest research focused on the interactions of International Teaching Assistants (ITAs) in the USA with their students (Axelson & Madden, 1994; Davies & Tyler, 1994; Douglas & Selinker, 1994; Tyler 1995). The main premise of these studies is that miscommunication occurs if linguistic resources and cultural frames do not match. Another branch of research has investigated international students' participation patterns in academic talk of different kinds and tutors' management of that talk, for instance in advising sessions (Back 2011; Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990; Tapper, 1996; Thonus, 1999; Young &Miller, 2004).

Most of this research has, at least implicitly, placed the blame for miscommunication or problems in communication on the "newcomer" to the target language, cultural and educational systems. This reflects a trend in the research across the disciplines, where the prevailing atmosphere is, according to Ryan and Viete (2009), still that of "nativespeakerdom":

> We talk of academic genres as if they were unchanging, of "rules" of argument and evidence particular to certain disciplines, of how a thesis has to be organised, what counts as critical analysis. It seems to most students that target skills are easier for "native speakers" to acquire and that their own knowledge, linguistically mediated as it is in another language, is seen as being of lesser value. (p. 307)

For instance, a recent study on the effectiveness of explicit instruction in teaching request strategies to EAP students at a UK university, postulates that "non-native speaker (NNS) students were often unable to produce pragmatically appropriate language in interactions inside and outside the classroom", which "meant their language could be perceived as rude as they may not adhere to expectations of positive and negative politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as appropriate to the context" (Halenko & Jones, 2011, p. 240).

This is just one example of the widespread assumption that non-native speakers, be it students or tutors, must adapt their interactional strategies to a native speaker norm. But the Anglophone university suffers from a dilemma, which Rajagopalan (2004) describes with the following example:

> Our past practices were premised on the key belief that someone who wants to learn English as a second or a foreign language does so in order to be able to communicate with the so-called native speakers of English. He or she wants to be able to order a pint of beer in a London pub or hail a taxi on the southern end of Manhattan. [...] Now, perhaps some fifty years or so ago, the chances were that the visitor could indeed hope to do these things with the help of the kind of English (mostly some standard variety, such as the Queen's English or the General American) they picked up in their EFL lessons. But not so any longer, as anyone who has been through these experiences in more recent years has learnt the hard way. A person unable to cope with the Punjabi or Greek accent of the waiter or the taxi driver is communicatively deficient and ill-equipped to that very extent. (p. 114)

It would be futile to expect, in today's Anglophone university, to meet a community of learners and tutors who have all been socialised into a homogenous variety of English spoken by the host community. What one will find instead is a range of non-native varieties, spoken at various levels of ability, as well as native-varieties shaped by students' and tutors' home communities

and the way English is integrated into their home life and the broad range of institutions which they have experienced, such as school.

Yet, English entrance examinations which universities require international students to take do not explicitly test interactional competence. For instance, the assessment criteria for the oral part of the IELTS test which most UK universities require for admission of international students, include fluency and coherence, lexical resources, grammatical resources and pronunciation, but make no reference to receptive skills or ability to tailor messages to context. Moreover, these examinations are based on the presumption of a native speaker norm (Jenkins, 2011):

> International English language requirements continue to be determined in accordance with entrance examinations grounded in native language, in other words, a national variety. […] By contrast, no consideration is given to the implications of the fact that once inside their 'international' universities, students will communicate primarily in non-native lingua franca English groups using interactive strategies that differ from those of native English academics. (p. 927)

Nativeculturedom (author's term)*,* the little sister of *nativespeakerdom* (Ryan & Viete 2009), has also driven roots into the educational research on international students' and academics' experience of learning and teaching at the Anglophone university. Whilst the research literature in this field may not draw overtly on frameworks such as Hofstede's dimensions of cultural difference (Hofstede, 1986), which equate culture with country of origin and suggests that problems in communication are due to cultural differences across various dimensions of behaviour, it often explains the difficulties of international students by contrasting traditions of learning. One particular focus has been the perceived difficulties of Asian learners at universities in the western world (Choi, 1997; Holmes, 2006; Jones, 1999; Jones, 2008; Kingston & Forland, 2008; Turner, 2006).

However, research in applied linguistics has recently undergone another paradigm shift. Sparked by the rising number of degree courses taught through the medium of English in countries outside of those belonging to the "inner circle", the number of studies on English as a lingua franca (ELF) is increasing (e.g. Björkman, 2011; Haberland, 2011; Jenkins, 2011; Knapp, 2011; Mauranen, 2006; 2010; Smit, 2010; Tange, 2010).

Rather than focusing on miscommunication, ELF research stresses the collaborative achievement of understanding through a common language and claims that partners in the interaction ignore and thus "make normal" deviant linguistic behaviour (Firth, 1996). However, a rare study on relationship aspects of ELF talk in academic settings, featuring a conflictual episode in an engineering class in Germany taught through the medium of English (Knapp 2001) shows that tutors' and students' cultural socialisation shapes their perceptions of institutional roles and their assessment of communicative styles. This suggests that the "make normal" principle may not apply to relationship management aspects of classroom interactions.

The Anglophone classroom is interactionally even more complex than the environment investigated by Knapp, as English is a native language for some but not all, and a national language of the country of the host institution. Moreover, students and academics represent a wide range of language and cultural experience. The following discussion of data will therefore contribute to uncovering these complexities to address the question of how tutors and students can be helped to develop effective classroom interactional strategies.

3. Data

The study draws on data from a small-scale study on classroom communication in culturally diverse classrooms in the UK. For this study, one one- or two-hour session each in three classes with a significant cultural mix of students was video-recorded during the 2010-11 academic year. The tutors teaching these classes were then retrospectively interviewed separately to each other. This included a semi-structured part as well as reflections stimulated by clips from the

recorded sessions that were played back to the tutors. Classes and tutors were recruited upon personal recommendations of university staff known to the author who were able to pinpoint tutors interested in issues of internationalisation and classes with a large proportion of international students. The researcher was thus not involved in the teaching of these classes.

The class that forms the focus of this case study is a first year Undergraduate Accounting tutorial which gives students the opportunity to apply, in a small group, concepts initially introduced in a larger lecture. The tutor for this class was male and originated from the "outer circle" of English speakers, having been brought up and receiving his primary and secondary education in Trinidad and Tobago and his higher education in the UK. Of the 13 students present in the session recorded, about half were from Britain and native speakers of English, and the other half were non-native speakers from a range of countries (Greece, Russia, China and Spain).

This class was chosen to form the basis for the case study because, in the retrospective interview based around chosen extracts from the class, the tutor proved to be very critical of his way of interacting with the class. I will draw on extracts from both the classroom itself as well as the reflections of the tutor to demonstrate and highlight their decision-making processes.

4. Discussion of data

The first extract of data is from the interview that had been conducted with the tutor of the Accounting class. When having extracts from a video recording of one of his classes replayed to him, the tutor asked for the recording to be stopped to have the opportunity to comment.

> Looking at myself now, I realise it carries me back to the day when I was in secondary school in Trinidad. […]. All secondary schools are not enclosed, [...] the buildings are spread apart and the classrooms are very open. So the windows are open etc. And teachers are usually very loud and it's exactly, it reminded me, it could be … this could be a classroom in Trinidad. The approach, everything as … yes, it's just the same way. It's not typical of the way people teach in the UK.

The tutor's comment indicates that he recognised influences from his cultural socialisation on his teaching style and, crucially, on his ways of communicating and speaking. He hinged this on the pitch of his voice, and the general approach he took to teaching. Moreover, he appeared to recognise distinct differences of his own teaching to what he perceived to be "typical" ways of teaching and communicating in the UK Anglophone classroom.

This examination of his own versus perceived UK norms of interaction continued throughout the interview:

Accounting Tutor:	Well silly, I'm looking at myself and obviously I appear like a dictator.
Researcher:	What makes you say that?
Accounting Tutor:	One - I'm loud, well which I'm always loud anyway. I'm loud. Well everyone in the class appears to be frightened. They appear to be frightened, and they're just sitting down there. And I'm the loudest in the classroom. So it appears that I … it looks like if I'm a dictator. I'm looking at it, I'm not sure if I'm really being effective […]. I want to know if this was necessarily effective or are these students frightened. I know what your opinion is but …

The tutor is concerned about two separate issues. Firstly, he is worried that his loud voice may threaten his ability to maintain a good relationship with the students, and secondly, he also questions his overall "effectiveness", that is his ability to attain the pedagogic goals of the class, which is a major element of the CIC framework outlined previously.

Research in interactional sociolinguistics suggests that hearers process linguistic cues of all kinds – be it intonation, word choice, turn-taking patterns etc. – against their own expectations and, from them, derive interpretations of the speaker's behaviour. These interpretations can lead to judgments about the attitude and intentions of the speaker (Gumperz, 1982). In this specific case, we have no conclusive evidence to suggest whether or not the tutor's loud voice indeed caused such attitudinal judgements and whether individual students were frightened. However, previous studies have shown that, if linguistic cues are misjudged by the other party, this can lead to negative evaluation and even discrimination (e.g. Akinnoso & Seabrook, 1982 on job interviews), in particular when the power in an interaction is unequally distributed.

One problem in addressing these challenges is that expectations are highly dependent on an individual's educational and linguistic socialisation (e.g. expectations of the tutor's role and status within the classroom, and experiences of what is a normal way for teachers to speak to students). If tutors were to receive any interactional training it would thus be futile to ask them to adapt to British norms of behaviour, or the norms of any other defined group of speakers, as the classrooms they are teaching are forever changing in their composition. Rather, the tutor's ability to reflect on his interactional style during the interview suggests that confronting participants retrospectively with their own interactions is a powerful vehicle to raise their awareness of the potential effects on a class of those interactions.

The next examples relate to one of the most central pedagogical goals of the classroom: to ensure students' understanding of the class content. The tutor explained his rationale as follows:

> But for me I always repeat it several times [...] And it does, you know, on some occasions you have, the first time you ask no one answers, the second time no one answers, but the third time somebody will say, "You know I didn't really understand something." And usually that's why I do several times over. […] I always try to listen, and I always try to ask students "Are you happy? Do you understand? Are you following? Correct interpretation?"

He implemented these strategies as follows:

> We sold another six hundred at two pounds sixty and then we sold three hundred at two pounds seventy giving us a total when we work each of them out of two nine nine five. Are we all happy with that? Yes? No? So SALES we know our sales figure is two nine nine five. We know that. Yes? COST of sales. So let's calculate cost of sales. Cost of sales, we know how to calculate cost of sales is opening stock plus your purchases? Minus your closing stock. So to calculate your cost of sales is opening stock plus purchases minus closing stock. Do we have any opening stock? Yes? No? NO opening stock. So there is probably no figure to go here. Do we have purchases? So if we look at our stock card? All you need to do is add up these three figures under your receipt. Are we together? Add up seven fifty plus fourteen hundred plus sixteen hundred giving us? Thirty-seven fifty. Yeah. So we know what our purchases are. It's thirty-seven fifty. Do we know where that's coming from. (small pause, looks into class) Yes or no?

This example is essentially a teacher monologue, occurring at a time when the tutor was explaining some calculations on the board with their students. However, he tried to assure himself of their understanding throughout the episode ("Are we all happy with that? Are we together?"), sometimes followed up by a yes/no-question. When asking these questions, he used collective forms of address ("we"). However, throughout this episode and similar ones during the lesson, there is little to no take-up from students indicating either understanding or non-understanding. A possible reason for this lack of take-up may be that students misinterpreted the tutor's questions, together with the short pauses that followed as token questions rather than questions inviting an answer. The collective "we" as a form of address may have contributed to this judgment.

The above episode shows that it is essential not to forget the co-constructed nature of CIC (Walsh, 2011) in that the problem is as much in the tutor's production as in the students' understanding. This is further amplified by the fact that the tutor is the more powerful of the speakers, the "gatekeeper" to the encounter, further constraining students' perceived rights to giving interactional feedback to the tutor.

From this episode it can be concluded that both tutors and students need to be supported in developing their meaning-making procedures, in particular for matching form (e.g. forms of address such as the collective "we") to function (who is asked to contribute?) and required action (what needs to be done now?).

The final example is an episode in which the tutor deals with students' errors. Error-correction is by its very nature a fraught episode for the management of relationships, as the tutor needs to point out to students the flaws in their understanding and learning. On the whole, this episode is representative of how this tutor deals with error-correction. In most cases, he would do this immediately after the error was made and in very direct ways:

Accounting Tutor:	So number four, which of the summarised balance sheet is correct? (long pause) You have a one in four chance.
Student:	Three (utterance).
Accounting Tutor:	That's wrong. (Student laughs). My friend next to her? Why two? Why do you think it's two?

On the face of it, this way of dealing with student errors contravenes the communicative values commonly attributed to British English, that is, that of politeness and indirectness. Moreover, the student's laughter might indicate that the tutor's directness did in fact cause her some embarrassment.

However, we have no way of verifying this and there is also no direct evidence of widespread unease within the class. What is more, research suggests that norms of politeness are not set as a rule-book, but negotiated by all conversational partners throughout the course of an interaction (Locher & Watts, 2005). In addition, House (2008) suggests that in settings in which English is used as a lingua franca, disaffiliative meaning such as disagreement or rejection is expressed without the usual delay and mitigation without threatening interpersonal relationships. This is confirmed by Smit's (2011) research on interaction in a hospitality course in Austria conducted through the medium of English as a Lingua Franca which uncovered unexpected levels of directness in tutor and student corrections, but no evidence suggesting that these entail high levels of face threat.

Finally, the negotiation of interactional norms is also performed against the background of the subject area being taught. In the case featured above, the student's answer to a multiple choice question was one of two things: right or wrong. In other cases, such as a politics class featuring topical discussion, expectations of error correction and feedback may well be very different and veer towards a more facilitative style.

The third conclusion is that students and tutors need to be supported in, and given the time and space to negotiate and discuss the interactional norms of the classroom, and they need to do this not only at the beginning of the term, but during the term when the class has got under way and routines have been established. This could prevent problems which then have to be either tackled retrospectively in student complaint procedures, or never come openly to the fore.

5. Discussion

The discussion of the examples from one UK classroom has shown that, whilst the varieties of English students and tutors use, their educational socialisation and their current competence levels in English do contribute to the linguistic choices and to the judgments they make, successful classroom interaction is dependent on their co-joint efforts in meaning-making. In addition, the power of the 'gatekeeper' within an interaction influences interactional outcomes. In classroom interaction, the teacher has natural gatekeeping power, which I argue has

contributed to students' lack of responsiveness in one of the examples quoted here more than any culturally-based reticence to speak. Moreover, the tutor in question had a loud and thunderous voice (a fact he remarked on himself during the interview), which may have further contributed to his perceived gatekeeping power and a reticence to speak by students.

This being said, it must be noted that native speaker status can lend further gatekeeping power to speakers. Mauranen (2012), a prominent scholar in the field of English as a Lingua Franca suggests that, when native speakers represent the majority within a group, the gatekeeping power, and thus the power to determine the norms of the interaction, is with them. Consequently, national norms for the use of English tend to dominate. In the Anglophone university, non-native speakers will often be the minority group: students might find themselves in this position in a class or whilst working on a group project. Equally, non-native tutors might equally be faced with a class composed mostly of nationals of the country in which the university is set.

This suggests that students and tutors need to be taught strategies that help them maximize their linguistic capital to deal with this and other possible scenarios effectively. Approximating native speaker norms of behaviour will be of little help (Mauranen, 2012):

> Rather than modelling the behaviours and expectations of a native English speaker […] in preparing learners for ELF interactions, we would be doing them a greater service by developing their strategic competence on the basis (a) that they will come to each interaction without necessarily sharing with the interlocutor a common social grammar and (b) that they should, therefore, be encouraged to employ any means at their disposal to establish mutual intelligibility in negotiating that interaction successfully. (p. 5)

Such strategic competence can hardly be developed by adopting approaches that presume nationally or culturally based norms of behaviour ("the Germans do…", "the Chinese tend to ...", etc.). Moreover, language courses alone will not be able to develop this competence unless they deal explicitly with the interface of language, culture and teaching styles (Luxon & Peelo, 2009). A possible alternative approach is based on the notion of "reflective practice", as described by Jones and Stubbe (2004) for professional communication.

The value of reflective practice can be demonstrated using a final episode from the Accounting classroom:

Tutor:	Which of the following is correct? And we will have this question now. Which of the following is correct? ((long pause))
Student 1:	B?
Tutor:	B? Do we all agree to B?
Student 2:	(unintelligible)
Tutor:	You think it's which one. Who thinks again it's B? Any other people who think that B might be the answer? Anyone else who think B? Why is it A?
Student 3:	Take away liability from assets to get capital.

This example showcases an episode during which the tutor takes the students through a worksheet with multiple choice questions. We notice that the tutor – and this is uncharacteristic for him – corrects Student 1's incorrect answer by very indirect means ("Do we all agree to B? Who thinks it's B? Any other people who think that B might be the answer?"). This does not achieve the desired effect, as none of the students volunteers an answer, forcing the tutor to provide it himself.

It is possible here that students, many of whom were non-native speakers of English, did not understand the tutor's cues that an error had been made, and that they did not understand the collective forms of address ("we", "anyone else?") as an invitation to answer. Moreover, the word "agree" may have indicated to them that the answer was correct.

I have suggested earlier on that, if tutors and students were to be supported to develop successful interactional strategies for the classroom, they need to be given the opportunity to reflect on examples, preferably their own practice. They also need to be supported in developing their meaning-making procedures for matching form to function, and they need to have the chance to negotiate and, if necessary, renegotiate the interactional norms under which a classroom operates.

The first two demands can be integrated in a programme designed upon the principle of "reflective practice". A programme designed to enhance tutors' classroom interactional competence would start by articulating an issue that needs to be addressed, for example, from the tutor's perspective: "There is a lack of student participation in my class". Participants would then be encouraged to reflect on and analyse the issue, ideally by using a video recording of an actual episode from their own classroom. However, for general awareness-raising, materials can be more generic and include video-recordings or transcripts of classroom talk from other classes which are then discussed with a focus on the main issue.

Participants' reflection can be further enhanced through the use of guided questions about form and function – e.g. What does students' silence indicate? – in order to draw out from them their expectations and actual experiences of the situation. This approach is designed to sensitize them to the different ways in which verbal and nonverbal strategies can be used to achieve communicative goals and for the motivations that may underlie observed behaviours and to help them recognize the expectations based on which they derive judgments on others.

In the next step, participants are encouraged to formulate and test a theory – for instance: "I could get better student participation if I ask individual students to comment". They are then encouraged to test out this theory, either by applying different strategies in a role-play, or by using them in real life (e.g. the next classroom encounter). Depending on the outcome of this test, participants either work on integrating new strategies into their interactional repertoire, or start the cycle of reflection afresh.

The goal of training that is designed in this way cannot endeavour to cover all possible scenarios which participants may find themselves in, but it can equip them with a wide range of strategic choices, and the flexibility to reflect on the success of an interaction while it is ongoing. This approach is also seconded by Angouri (2010), who, discussing ways of preparing EFL students for workplace meetings, suggests that they need to be "prepared for the generic diversity they are likely to encounter […] so that they can efficiently adapt their skills to the local setting, various situations and (multinational) audiences" (Angouri, 2010, p. 220). This approach takes away the need for copying native speakers' behaviours or more experienced teachers, as for example proposed by Gorsuch (2006) in her account of a training programme for ITAs in the USA.

However, it is vital that the onus for undertaking such training is not solely on international tutors or, conversely, on international students. Currently, it is students who speak non-native varieties of English alone who sit through pre-sessional courses and take in-sessional English language support in order to learn how to engage effectively in academic English. It is often also them who are blamed when classroom interaction is unsuccessful and relationships break down, ignoring the fact that there are always at least two participants in an interaction. Hence the conclusion (Otten, 2003; Spencer-Oatey & Xiong, 2006) that both academics and students need to be involved in such training is only logical. Moreover, it is only by involving all members of a classroom community that the third of the demands that I have outlined earlier – negotiating interactional norms – can be effectively put in place.

6. Conclusion

This paper uncovers, by combining analysis of classroom interactions with retrospective accounts by a tutor teaching this class, the complexities of classroom interaction at one Anglophone university. However, the nature of these complexities and the fact that other "inner

circle" countries are undergoing similar HE internationalisation processes, means that they also occur in other Anglophone universities located in "inner circle" countries.

The paper hopes to appeal to researchers and practitioners in applied linguistics and in educational studies to join forces to investigate interactions in academic settings not only for the sake of academic discovery, but with the explicit aim of using their insights for designing staff development programmes to improve the classroom interactional competence of tutors and students. Insights from applied linguistics will be necessary to aid reflection about the effectiveness of different interaction patterns, whilst those from educational studies will provide insights into the decision making processes of tutors and students.

Most importantly however, this paper calls on the Anglophone university to put the burden on "fitting in" not only on the international student, but on all. To do so will require processes to be put in place that allow all members of the campus community to become better communicators in multilingual and multicultural spaces, a skill vital for the workplace of the 21st century.

Acknowledgements

References

Akinnoso, F. N. & Seabrook Ajirotuti, C. (1982). Performance and ethnic style in job interviews. In J. Gumperz (Ed.). *Language and social identity* (pp. 119-144). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Angouri, J. (2010). If we know about culture it will be easier to work with one another: Developing skills for handling corporate meetings with multinational participation. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *10*(3), 206-224.

Axelson, E., & Maden, C. (1994). Discourse strategies for ITAs across instructional contexts. In C. Madden & C. Myers (Eds.). *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants* (pp. 153-185). Alexandria: TESOL Publications.

Back, J. (2011). How far can face and hierarchy affect developing interaction between Korean university students and their supervisors in the United Kingdom? In B. Preisler, I. Klitgard & A. Fabricius (Eds.). *Language and learning in the international university: From English uniformity to diversity and hibridity* (pp. 212-230). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartfod, B. (1990). Congruence in native and nonnative conversations: Status balance in the academic advising session. *Language Learning*, *40*(4), 467-501.

Björkman, B. (2011). Pragmatic strategies in English as an academic lingua franca: Ways of achieving communicative effectiveness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*, 950-964.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Choi, M. (1997). Korean students in Australian universities: Intercultural Issues. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *16*(3), 263-282.

Davies, C., & Tyler, A. (1994). Demystifying cross-cultural (mis)communication: Improving performance through balanced feedback in a situated context. In C. Madden & C. Myers (Eds.). *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants* (pp. 201-220). Alexandria: TESOL Publications.

Douglas, D., & Selinker, L. (1994). Native and nonnative teaching assistants: A case study of discourse domains and genres. In C. Madden & C. Myers (Eds.). *Discourse and performance of international teaching assistants* (p. 221-230). Alexandria: TESOL Publications.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: on 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *26*(2), 237-259.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haberland, H. (2011). Ownership and maintenance of a language in transnational use: Should we leave our *lingua franca* alone? *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(4), 937-949.

Halenko, N., & Jones, C. (2011). Teaching pragmatic awareness of spoken requests to Chinese EAP learners in the UK: Is explicit instruction effective? *System*, *39*(2), 240-250.

HESA (n.d.). *UK Student Population 2010-11*. Retrieved November 16, 2012, from www.hesa.ac.uk.

Hyland, F., Trahar, S., Anderson, J., & Dickens, A. (2008). *A changing world: The internationalisation experiences of staff and students (home and international) in UK Higher Education*. Higher Education Academy.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *10*(3), 301-320.

Holmes, P. (2006). Problematising intercultural communication competence in the pluricultural classroom: Chinese students in a New Zealand university. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *6*(1)**,** 18-34.

House, J. (2008). Impoliteness in English as a Lingua Franca discourse. In M. Locher & J. Strässler (Eds.). *Contributions to the sociology of language: standards and norms in the English Language* (pp. 351-366). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hüllen, W. (1992). Identifikationssprache und Kommunikationssprache. Über Probleme der Mehrsprachigkeit. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik*, *20*(3), 298-317.

IELTS (n.d.). *IELTS Assessment Criteria: Speaking*. Retrieved November 9, 2012, from: http://www.ieltsessentials.com/pdf/BandcoreDescriptorsSpeaking.pdf.

Jenkins, J. (2011). Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(4), 926-936.

Jones, J. (1999). From silence to talk: Cross-cultural ideas on students' participation in academic group discussions. *English for Specific Purposes*, *18*(3), 243-259.

Jones, M. (2008). International students' cross-cultural experiences of learning. *IJAPS*, *4*, 41-73.

Jones, D., & Stubbe, M. (2004). Communication and the reflective practitioner: A shared perspective from sociolinguistics and organisational communication. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(2), 185-211.

Kachru, B. (1992). World Englishes: approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, *25*, 1-14.

Kingston, E., & Forland, H. (2008). Bridging the gap in expectations between international students and academic staff. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *12*, 204-221.

Knapp, A. (2011). Using English as a lingua franca for (mis-)managing conflict in an international university context: An example from a course in engineering. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(4), 978-990.

Locher, M., & Watts, R. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *1*(1), 9-33.

Luxon, T., & Peelo, M. (2009). Academic sojorners, teaching and internationalisation: the experience of non-UK staff in a British university. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *14*(6), 649-659.

Mauranen, A. (2006). Signaling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *177*, 123-150.

Mauranen, A. (2012). Exploring ELF. Academic English shaped by non-native speakers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murray, N. (2012). English as a lingua franca and the development of pragmatic competence. *ELT Journal*, *10*, 1-9.

Otten, M. (2003). Intercultural learning and diversity in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *7*(1), 12-26.

Ryan, J., & Viete, R. (2009). Respectful interactions: Learning with international students in the English-speaking academy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *14*(3), 303-314.

Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The concept of 'World English' and its implications for ELT. *ELT Journal*, *58*(2), 111-117.

Singh, P., & Doherty, C. (2008). Mobile students in liquid modernity: negotiating the politics of transnational identities. In N. Dolby & F. Rizvi (Eds.). *Youth moves: Identities and education in global perspective* (pp. 115-130). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Smit, U. (2010). English as a Lingua Franca in Higher Education: A longitudinal study of classroom discourse. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Spencer-Oatey, H., & Xiong, Z. (2006). Chinese students' psychological and sociocultural adjustments to Britain: An empirical study. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(1), 37-53.

Tange, H. (2010). Caught in the Tower of Babel: University lecturers' experiences with internationalisation. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *10*(2), 137-149.

Tapper, J. (1996). Exchange patterns in the oral discourse of international students in university classrooms. *Discourse Processes*, *22*(1), 25-55.

Thonus, T. (1999). Dominance in academic writing tutorials: Gender, language proficiency, and the offering of suggestions. *Discourse & Society*, *10*(2), 225-248.

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.

Tyler, A. (1995). The co-construction of cross-cultural miscommunication. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *17*(2), 129-151.

Walsh, S. (2011). Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action, London: Routledge.

Welikala, T., & Watkings, C. (2008). Improving intercultural experience: responding to cultural scripts for learning in UK Higher Education. London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Young, R., & Miller, E. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ELS writing conferences. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 519-535.