

Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning for Christians in Higher Education

Volume 10 | Issue 1

Article 6

2020

A Theoretical Perspective of Culturally Responsive Andragogy for International English Learners in American Higher Education Institutions

Marcia P. Livingston-Galloway
Oral Roberts University, malivingston@oru.edu

Janet George
Oral Roberts University, jageorge@oru.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalshowcase.oru.edu/sotl_ched



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Livingston-Galloway, M. & and George, J. (2020). A theoretical perspective of culturally responsive andragogy for international English learners in American higher education institutions. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning for Christians in Higher Education*, 10(1), 35-52. <https://doi.org/10.31380/sotlched.10.1.35>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Showcase. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning for Christians in Higher Education* by an authorized editor of Digital Showcase. For more information, please contact digitalshowcase@oru.edu.

A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

OF CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE ANDRAGOGY
FOR INTERNATIONAL ENGLISH LEARNERS IN
AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Marcia Livingston-Galloway, Oral Roberts University

Janet George, Oral Roberts University

*Journal of the Scholarship
of Teaching and Learning for Christians in
Higher Education* 10.1 (2020) 35-52
http://digitalshowcase.oru.edu/sotl_ched/

Key Words *CLEED, ELL, English language learners, andragogy, diverse, international, IIE, students, higher education*

Abstract

“Higher education institutions throughout the United States and other countries are experiencing significant increases in the number of international students enrolled at their campuses” (Washburn & Hargis, 2017, p. 2). However, the rate of growth for this cohort of culturally, linguistically, economically, and ethnically diverse (CLEED) students exceeds the rate of faculty preparation and capacity to effectively serve their needs. Statistical evidence corroborates the view of Enright (2011) and others that today’s diverse

student body is now “the ‘new mainstream’ of the 21st century classroom” (p. 80). Research in the last two decades points to a real need for culturally responsive andragogy that is inclusive of all learners. Faculty development that includes training in linguistic and culturally sensitive andragogy is a meaningful response. This paper contains a review of extant literature pertinent to this issue and recommends practical, culturally relevant, and responsive, research-based teaching approaches that are framed within sociocultural learning theory and effective for use in classrooms with international English language learners.

Introduction

*T*he Institute of International Education (IIE) (2019) reports that in the last four consecutive years, over a million international students have been recorded among those pursuing college education in the United States with the highest number, 1,095,299, recorded for the 2018-19 academic year (see Table 1). The number represents students in academic programs as well as Optional Practical Training. The data reveals that the highest percentages of international students come from nations whose native languages are other than English, with 52% represented by China and India combined. The IIE (2019) notes that this growing cohort of English language learners (ELLs) represents over 400 languages from diverse cultural, socioeconomic, and linguistic backgrounds. In light of these and other realities, educators need to reevaluate the way they package and deliver their content to “the ‘new mainstream’ of the 21st century classroom” (Enright, 2011, p. 80), a diverse demographic and cultural group that is replacing the traditional higher education student body. In U.S. higher education, both domestic and international students comprise this new mainstream

Top Countries of Origin of International Students					
		2017/18	2018/19	% of total	% change
World Total		1,094,792	1,095,299	100.00	0.05
1	China	363,341	369,548	33.7	1.7
2	India	196,271	202,014	18.4	2.9
3	S. Korea	54,555	52,250	4.8	-4.2
4	Saudi Arabia	44,432	37,080	3.4	-16.5
5	Canada	25,909	26,122	2.4	0.8
6	Vietnam	24,325	24,392	2.2	0.3
7	Taiwan	22,454	23,369	2.1	4.1
8	Japan	18,753	18,105	1.7	-3.5
9	Brazil	14,620	16,059	1.5	9.8
10	Mexico	15,468	15,229	1.4	-1.5

Table 1. *Top 10 Places of Origin of International Students Enrolled in U.S. Higher Education*

Table adapted from Institute of International Education: Open Doors Fast Facts (2019).

A majority of international students come to the United States to pursue a college education (Garcia, Pujol-Ferran, & Reddy, 2013) after successfully completing high school in their home countries and demonstrating their English language proficiency on a standardized test, often the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). Unfortunately, because the TOEFL score for college admission differs among institutions, proficiency levels vary among international students, resulting in some students needing personalized support that considers their cultures and prepares them for academic rigor in their fields of study (Bergey, Movit, Baird, & Faria, 2018). Those who are unable to access help or don't risk asking for help use their language proficiency to mediate or mask their learning across disciplines (Enright, 2011). Furthermore, unlike their native English-speaking counterparts, to achieve academic success and complete their studies in the requisite time, international ELLs have to adapt to the new culture

and learn academic content in English while simultaneously developing their academic English language proficiency (American Institute for Research, 2018).

The readiness of educators in American higher education institutions to effectively deliver instruction to a growing linguistically and culturally diverse (CLEED) international student population is gaining more attention in the extant body of literature. Many of these recent studies principally focus on the learners' English language deficits, the cultural adjustment challenges they face in their new contexts, the paucity of academic and other support services, and reports of perceptions of invisibility among some ethnic groups. References to teacher preparedness either allude to the under-preparedness of instructors in higher education to serve their diverse student body or highlight the need for cultural responsiveness training among educators in higher education (Gay, 2002; Harrison & Shi, 2016; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Wang & Machado, 2015). They also continue to emphasize the traditional teacher-centered or learner-centered approaches to teaching and learning. Teacher effectiveness, measured by students' achievement of the stated learning outcomes, is optimized when everyone in the learning community invests in the knowledge fund and assumes the role of teacher-learner.

The purpose of this paper is to explore some of the existing literature on the need to develop culturally sensitive classrooms in the higher education space in order to identify instructional approaches that are used in teaching international English language learners. The paper then recommends culturally responsive, research-based teaching strategies—using sociocultural learning (SCL) as a guiding theory—strategies that faculty can adapt to help the international English language learners in their classrooms.

Theoretical Framework Background

Numerous theoretical perspectives have shaped existing research focused on dealing with the multiple challenges that have accompanied the growing number of CLEED international students to higher education. To focus this paper, the authors therefore decided to review only

education studies that fit the following criteria: empirical or peer-reviewed, published between 2000 and 2020, and relevant to teaching English learners in English as a second language (ESL) or English as a foreign language (EFL) in higher education settings in the United States and abroad. The authors realize that many of the studies that match these criteria specifically address teaching children and adolescents in the preschool through twelfth grade (P-12) context. Nevertheless, the dominant theoretical arguments that emerge in the review of relevant P-12 studies cluster around theories that are similar to those predominant in higher education: positivists/behaviorism, social constructivism, socioculturalism, and critical theories. The authors selected sociocultural learning theory (SCL) because of its recognizable relationship to culturally responsive teaching.

Culturally responsive teaching is an approach that uses “the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively” (Gay, 2002, p.106). Lopez (2011) points to the need for teachers to be intentional about “engaging in culturally relevant teaching practices” and “. . . drawing on relevant socio-cultural theories and creating their own purposeful praxis” (p. 76). The underlying assumption of the SCL theory is that “human mental activity is a mediated process in which symbolic and socioculturally constructed artifacts, the most significant of which being the language, play an essential role in the mental life of the individual” (Vygotsky, as cited in Shabani, 2016, p.2). In other words, language is an essential element of every culture and the learning process itself. According to Halliday (1993), language is critical to learning because learning is a linguistic process that occurs in three interrelated areas: learning language, learning about language, and learning through language. In concurrence with the view that language and social interaction share a symbiotic relationship, Nieto (2010) reiterates that language learning is not solely cognitive, but rather, a consequence of learners engaging in multiple forms of interactions with others in their learning community, all of which are informed by one’s culture. Unfortunately, in many of these learning contexts, students and teachers assume the traditional roles of consumers and transmitters of learning respectively, and because of their language differences, international

students are often marginalized and stereotyped. Despite the dynamism implicit in the features of SCL—which emphasizes the critical role that culture, community, and social relationships play in learner cognition and development—the learning often conforms to a learner-centered approach (Wang, 2007). Consequently, SCL's effectiveness is in question in today's CLEED classrooms.

Sociocultural Learning in Classrooms

The literature reviewed on teaching English language learners highlights the role that students' background knowledge and culture play in the learning process. In their analysis of empirical research conducted in the United States on the preparation of reading teacher educators, Risko, Roller, Cummins, Bean, Block, Anders, and Flood (2008) conclude that the sociocultural theory assists educators in their understanding of options they can use to teach culturally and linguistically diverse students. A classroom is the place where learning, a social process, formally occurs (Behroozizad, Nambiar, & Amir, 2014; Lee, 2015; Umer & Gul, 2019; Wang, 2007) and is essentially a mini society. The primary role in the classroom is ascribed to the instructor, whose responsibility includes lesson preparation, delivery (Umer & Gul, 2019), and the facilitation of learner interactions in varying degrees.

In her study of sociocultural theories and information literacy teaching activities in higher education, Wang (2007) describes how the zone of proximal distance, a feature of SCT, guided students in various learning activities to develop information literacy. She describes collaborative pedagogical learning models based on SCT:

- Problem-based model—learners collaborate to solve content-related problems (i.e., collaborative peer group learning);
- Reciprocal model—students scaffold others or are scaffolded during class interactions through questioning, clarifying, predicting, and summarizing course content;
- Resource-based model—learners use resources (e.g., people, books, equipment, tools and agencies to aid learning; and
- The jigsaw model—student reinforce content learning by taking turns to teach assigned sections of an area of content to others in the learning community.

Wang concludes that students optimize learning by collaborating and engaging in the learning process and capitalizing on available resources in their learning community. She also notes that SCT promotes active learning during which learners have the added benefit of participating in meaningful cultural exchanges. Wang believes results from her study confirm that SCT positively impacts student achievement and cognitive development. Dongyu, Fan, and Wanyi (2013) concur, adding that since learning is the product of shared activities among learners, collaborative learning should take precedence over the traditional teacher-student relationship. Reporting on her investigation of classroom discourse between Chinese international English learners and their British instructors who employ the communicative language teaching approach from a sociocultural theory perspective, Yang (2016) notes that “how students participate and engage in meaning-making activities depends largely on how teachers socially and culturally organize activities” (p.195). In the study, interactions occurred only between the students and teacher. Hence, in her conclusion, she remarks, “Teachers can employ effective discourse to liven up the classroom atmosphere and provide opportunities for students to involve themselves in the classroom activities” (p. 198); however, that does not automatically result in making meaning, which is necessary for academic success and authentic communicative competence in the wider speech community.

In a study on the impact of implementing the sociocultural theory in an adult ESL classroom, Lee (2015) identifies three emergent themes: (1) the impact of the student-teacher relationship on student learning; (2) the advantage of interaction in the learning community over lecturing; and (3) the importance of cultural sensitivity. An analysis of the themes led her to conclude that the sociocultural theory is valuable for adult learners in ESL programs as it is composed of a cultural and an educational approach that can be identified in social collaboration, cultural connection, and all components of the education environment. Themes (2) and (3) also emerged among the findings of other studies that link instructional approaches to the sociocultural theory of learning (Gay, 2010; Marambe, Vermunt, & Boshuizen, 2011; Muñoz de Cote & Dijk, 2012; Zhou et al., 2008).

Cultural Influence on Pedagogy

Dongyu, Fan, and Wanyi (2013) observe from their study of the sociological theory applied to Chinese second language learners that Chinese students traditionally tend to prefer teacher-centered classrooms. They surmise that Chinese students generally expect learning to occur in the same manner as in their home country where the teacher is the sole dispenser of information and knowledge. In that cultural setting, students rely on memorization and produce the information on a test or when asked to do so. The findings from this study correspond to those from Zhou, Jindal-Snape, Topping, and Todman's (2008) review of the development theories of culture shock. According to their study, the Chinese students' learning approach while studying in Britain was informed by deep-rooted aspects of the Chinese culture. They also viewed teachers as models of knowledge and morality and expected them to initiate communication and take care of them and their learning. The students in the study were passive learners who desired to learn like they did in China. In contrast, the British instructors expected that because the students were from collectivist cultures, they would want to collaborate and participate in group learning. They expect university students to be autonomous, independent learners and were very surprised when they experienced the opposite. Based on this finding, the authors encourage instructors to make every effort to learn about their students and their cultural backgrounds so that they can develop appropriate culturally responsive instructional strategies.

In a comparative study of learning patterns of students across different cultures, Marambe, Vermunt, and Boshuizen (2011) note a distinct difference between the learning patterns of Asian and European students. The sample comprised Dutch, Indonesian, and Sri Lankan groups of students. Other results from the study show remarkable differences between the learning patterns of the two Asian groups, dispelling the myth that Asians have similar learning patterns. Like the Chinese, "In Sri Lanka, at examinations students are required to reproduce the information and knowledge transmitted in the classroom considerably, despite the fact that this practice is being criticized in many instances" (p. 302). The findings also support the need for

teachers of international students to acquaint themselves with the study habits, norms, and perspectives international students bring to the new learning context.

Discussion and Conclusions

Findings that emerge from the review of the literature indicate that educators in American higher education institutions are aware of the large numbers CLEED students on their campuses and are concerned about how to effectively teach them. The call to develop and deliver culturally relevant courses is a growing preoccupation in the minds of instructors and administrators alike. Larke (2013) notes that at its inception, culturally responsive teaching was directed at P-12 teachers who were challenged to provide equal education to their diverse student population. In addition to navigating the culture of their students, instructors also must consider ways to mediate the language challenges that some international students bring to the classroom. Although international English language learners may present some challenges for many instructors, it is important that everyone realizes that “it is not enough to understand the theoretical underpinnings of culturally relevant or responsive pedagogies; teachers must be able to answer for themselves the question of what does this look like and feel like in my classroom” (p. 76).

Culturally responsive andragogy is a step beyond being culturally sensitive. It is the action that instructors take to plan engaging, inclusive lessons, after conducting an honest personal cultural awareness inspection, to identify biases that could potentially impair their views of students who speak, look, and think differently from them. The literature points out that some instructors default to a deficit approach when they engage with international English learners, rather than embrace them as assets who possess knowledge, skills, perspectives, and a rich resource that they can withdraw from and invest in (Colbert, 2010; Gay, 2002; Wang & Machado, 2015). On the other hand, some instructors wrongly assume that all international ELLs in higher education have attained high academic mastery in English. Per their study, Harrison and Shi (2016) discovered that was not always the case. They affirm that international English learners “rely on a complex set

of personal language and academic learning skills as well as culturally embedded notions” (p. 418) to navigate their academic environments. Some students struggle academically because they are afraid to risk asking for help from peers and instructors who assume they are doing well. In response to this type of academic challenge, Buckridge and Guest (2007) referenced the active learning-centered classroom.

The learning-centered classroom approach to learning is slowly appearing in the literature and is associated with SCT because of its collaborative and interactive features. The learning-centered classroom approach is based on the idea that the learners and instructor constitute the learning community where every person enters with academic and cultural capital and is therefore expected to participate in the learning exchange. Here, the teacher’s principal role is to plan culturally responsive lessons, facilitate the learning, scaffold the learners as necessary, and encourage or demand 100 percent participation. The following statements by Moeller and Catalano (2015) aptly describe the scene in a regular teacher-centered/student-centered classroom where zones of proximal distance are often in effect: “The interaction between an expert (teacher) and novice (learner) in a problem-solving task (scaffolding) in which the expert’s role was to provide the novice with instructional support then became the model for communicative tasks in the foreign language classrooms” (330). Learning-centered classrooms create opportunities for learning through whole group or small group collaborations, as well as problem solving and project developments. As learners interact and the content is delivered, learners learn to appreciate the cultures, personalities, strengths, and challenges of each other and build a strong learning community.

Studies suggest that instructors are faced with their inability to accurately understand the complex nature of their ELLs’ cultural (sometimes multicultural) backgrounds. Trice (2003) pointed to the lack of information and awareness on the part of faculty to fully comprehend the challenges faced by ELLs in the classroom. Faculty who are usually experts in their fields find themselves at a loss when their ELLs struggle to engage effectively in the teaching-learning process. To use an analogy from communication studies, there seems to be a lot of “noise” or “distortion” between what the sender (instructor) says and what the receiver

(ELL) actually hears. While it is important to have subject-matter expertise and subject-specific pedagogical understanding, studies suggest that the most successful instructors are those who are “attentive to the complexities of social, economic, and cultural dynamics” (Mishkind, 2016, p. 1) of their students. The authors recommend that further study be done to determine the effect of different instructional variables and measures on students’ learning patterns over a longer time period. The findings support the position that culture, education, and learning are interconnected, but also show that although culture impacts international students’ approaches to learning, those approaches may be inconsistent with the learning approaches in their new learning environment.

Some challenges are intimidating and frustrating to faculty who feel ill-equipped to suitably serve the academic needs of their students. In response to some of these issues, some educational administrators have resorted to ad hoc professional development focused on cultural sensitivity and good instructional practices for instructors, rather than develop an effective strategic plan that will have a more sustainable impact. Harrison and Shi (2016) indicate that instructors, who have expert knowledge of the content they are teaching, know how to deliver that content within established norms. However, “little attention [is] given to how that content is received outside of the norms” (p. 418). Thus, their lack of awareness of the reasons for an ELL’s comprehension (or lack thereof) of the content results in an unsatisfactory instructional process.

Washburn and Hargis (2017) contend that “The faculty of institutions that are engaged in the increased recruitment of international students may be unprepared for the significant resources required to effectively engage international students in the learning process” (p.3). Regardless of the differing perspectives among instructors and across institutions, it is becoming apparent that those who desire to retain their IS and to attract others, are looking for effective research-based strategies that they can adapt to their population. The next and final section outlines several research-based practical instructional strategies, tools, and suggestions for consideration as faculty develop and deliver culturally sensitive instruction in a diverse classroom.

Recommendations

While the need to provide a safe space in the classroom is important for all students, it is particularly valuable for the ELL who is studying in a higher educational program. From their study of the sociological theory applied to Chinese second language learners, Dongyu, Fan, and Wanyi (2013) observed a change in the learning preference of Chinese students and a growing acceptance of learner-centered classrooms within the Chinese student community, where they are more open to participating in classroom activities, collaborating with their peers, and “prefer the way of learning based on teacher/student discussion and negotiation” (p. 171). This is one indication of a change in attitudes and expectations of international ELLs. The following is a brief list of research-based tips and recommendations to help the instructor who wants to ensure culturally sensitive andragogical practices in their classroom and meet these changing expectations:

- Create a safe, welcoming classroom environment for students. Be genuine and encourage students to engage and invest in their learning (Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-González, 2008).
- Learn a little about students’ countries and cultures (Pappamihel, 2002).
- Communicate classroom protocols early (Pinantoan, 2015; Washburn & Hargis, 2017).
- Provide lecture notes or PowerPoints to students ahead of time, and link main points of the lecture to other connective concepts to enable ELLs to familiarize themselves with content and to facilitate course engagement. (Harrison & Shi, 2016; Pappamihel, 2002; Pinantoan, 2015; Washburn & Hargis, 2017).
- Provide note taking guides to students (Pinantoan, 2015; Washburn & Hargis, 2017).
- Integrate visual aids, interactive content, adaptive technology, simulations, and virtual reality technologies to enhance teaching and learning (Dahlstrom, de Boor, Grunwald, & Vockley, 2011).
- Highlight key questions or issues in written and verbal forms

(Biggs, 2003; Ryan, 2005).

- Create concept maps and connect them to related content (Pinantoan, 2015).
- Define unfamiliar words and concepts and allow time for clarification (Washburn & Hargis, 2017).
- Use neutral language, avoid slang, and address political and religious topics with respect (Pinantoan, 2015; Washburn & Hargis, 2017).
- Encourage cultural exchanges in class giving learners opportunities to address relevant topics from their cultural perspectives and connect learning to their experiences (Pappamihel, 2002; Pinantoan, 2015).
- Be conscious of your non-verbal communication, and apologize quickly if you offend someone (Pinantoan, 2015; Washburn & Hargis, 2017).
- Validate students' cultures by including examples in course instructions from a global perspective, and asking them how issues would be addressed from their experiences (Pinantoan, 2015; Washburn & Hargis, 2017).
- Write key concepts and vocabulary on the board to ensure correct spelling and reduce misunderstandings and allow students to restate assignment instructions.
- Encourage ELLs to work with domestic students (Pinantoan, 2015; Washburn & Hargis, 2017).
- Provide extra time in formative and summative assessments to allow for processing between languages.
- Summarize discussions and use valid assessments.
- Model professional behavior and use the academic language you expect students to use.
- Be the living curriculum.

Conclusion

Although the foregoing is not a complete treatise on a topic that has so many more facets and layers that could be explored, it is the hope of the authors that some of the information herein will ignite

conversations among faculty and administrators in higher education institutions with international ELLs on their campuses and inspire them to begin to implement at least incremental changes in the way they serve the international students. Harrison and Shi (2016) re-emphasize the current realities of ELLs in American higher education institutions and renew the call for andragogical changes in our culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms:

The graduate level university classroom is a dynamic space embedded with culturally influenced actions and speech. Without conscious attention by the instructor to the ways that language is used and received, many ELLs struggle to attain academic standing to the level of their native English-speaking peers. (p.426)

The authors concur with the already expressed assertions in the literature that international ELLs in American colleges can thrive and succeed if they receive the requisite help from instructors who are prepared with the strategies and dispositions to help them adjust to the new academic environment and manage the cultural differences they experience on campus (Harrison & Shi, 2016; Washburn & Hargis, 2017).

The authors have been able to practice several of the strategies with their international students and watched them flourish. When international students, particularly ELLs, leave the safety and structure of their worlds and cultures and come to the U.S., they help us create a loving simulation community where we can practice, learn, and grow. The international English language learners in our institutions need us to respond to their unique needs.

REFERENCES

- Alzahrani, M. A. (2018). The learning experience of international students in Canada: Progressive educational theory and passive learning styles. *English Language Teaching, 11*(7). 76-85. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n7p76>.

- Bartram, B. (2007). The sociocultural needs of international students in higher education: A comparison of staff and student views. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(2), 205-214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306297731>.
- Behroozizad, S., Nambiar, R. M. K., & Amir, Z. (2014). Sociocultural theory as an approach to aid EFL learners. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 14(2), 217-226.
- Bergey, R., Movit, M., Baird, A. S., & Faria, A. (2018). Serving English language learners in higher education: Unlocking the potential. *American Institutes for Research*.
- Biggs, J. (2003). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Buckridge, M., & Guest, R. (2007). A conversation about pedagogical responses to increased diversity in university classrooms. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 26(2), 133-146.
- Colbert, P. J. (2010). Developing a culturally responsive classroom collaborative of faculty, students, and institution. *MBA Faculty Conference Papers & Journal Articles, 1*. https://scholarsarchive.jwu.edu/mba_fac/1.
- Cote, L. M. M., & Dijk, S. (2012). Intercultural challenge to language learning. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssl.2012.2.4.6>.
- Dahlstrom, E., de Boor, T., Grunwald, P., Vockley, M. (2011). National study of undergraduate students and information technology. *EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research*.
- Dongyu, Z., Fan, Yu, & Wanyi, D. (2013). Sociocultural theory applied to second language learning: Collaborative learning with reference to the Chinese context. *International Education Studies*, 6(9), 165-174. <https://doi.org/10.105539/ies.v6n9p165>.
- Enright, K. A. (2011). Language and literacy for a new mainstream. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(1), 80-118. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831210368989>.
- García, O., Pujol-Ferran, M., & Reddy, P. (2012). Educating international and immigrant students in US higher education: Opportunities and challenges. *English-Medium Instruction at Universities*. <https://doi.org/10.21832%2F9781847698162-013>.

- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2). 106-116.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1993). Towards a language-based theory of learning. *Linguistics and Education*, 5. 93-116.
- Harrison, J. & Shi, H. (2016). English language learners in higher education: An exploratory conversation. *Journal of International Students*, 6(2), 415-430.
- Institute of International Education. (2019). Number of international students in the United States hits all-time high. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*.
- Larke, P. (2013). Culturally responsive teaching in higher education: What professors need to know. *Counterpoints*, 391, 38-50. www.jstor.org/stable/42981435.
- Lee, M. S. (2015). Implementing the sociocultural theory while teaching ESL. *SPACE: Student Perspectives About Civic Engagement*, 1(1), 28-35.
- Lopez, A. E. (2011). Culturally relevant pedagogy and critical literacy in diverse English classrooms: A case study of a secondary English teacher's activism and agency. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 10(4), 75-93.
- Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-González, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 361-373.
- Marambe, K. N., Vermunt, J. D., & Boshuizen, H. P. A. (2011). A cross-cultural comparison of student learning patterns in higher education. *High Educ*, 64. 299-316. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-011-9494-z>.
- Mishkind, A. (2016). Adult education: What makes teaching effective? California Department of Education. Retrieved from https://www.calpro-online.org/documents/CALPRO_BRIEF_13_508.pdf.
- Moeller, A. K. & Catalano, T. (2015). Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. *Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning*

- and Teacher Education*, 196. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub/196>.
- Nieto, S. (2010). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*, 10th anniversary edition. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Pappamihel, N. E. (2002). English as a second language students and English language anxiety: Issues in the mainstream classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 36, 327-355.
- Pinantoan, A. (2015). *10 tips on how to teach international students effectively*. Open Academic. Retrieved from <http://www.opencolleges.edu.au/informed/trends/10-tipsteaching-international-students-effectively/>.
- Risko, V. J., Roller, C. M., Cummins, C., Bean, R. M., Block, C. C., Anders, P., & Flood, J. (2008). A critical analysis of research on teacher education. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(3), 252-288. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.3.3>.
- Ryan, J. (2005). Improving teaching and learning practices for international students: Implications for curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. In J. Carroll & J. Ryan (Eds.), *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all*. New York: Routledge.
- Shabani, K. (2016). Applications of Vygotsky's sociocultural approach for teachers' professional development. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), 1252177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1252177>
- Trice, A. G. (2003). Faculty perceptions of graduate international students: The benefits and challenges. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(4), 379-403. <https://doi-org.oralroberts.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1028315303257120>
- Umer, M. & Gul, R. (2019). The relevance of sociocultural theory for linguistic skills development: Classroom observations. *The Dialogue*, 14(4), 132-142.
- Wang, L. (2007). Sociocultural learning theories and information literacy teaching activities in higher education. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 47(2), 149-158.
- Wang, P. & Machado, C. (2015). Meeting the needs of Chinese English language learners at writing centers in America: A proposed culturally responsive model. *Journal of International Studies*, 5(2), 143-160.

Washburn, C., & Hargis, J. (2017). Changes in faculty practice for international students: A case study. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, 10(1), 1-18.

Zhou, Y., Jindal-Snape, D., Topping, K., & Todman, J. (2008).

Theoretical models of culture shock and adaptation in international students in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(1), 63-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701794833>.

Dr. Marcia P. Livingston-Galloway is Professor & ELL Coordinator in the College of Education at Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, OK. She earned a B.A. in Languages with Social Science from the University of the West Indies, a M.B.A. from Nova Southeastern University, and a M.Ed. from Regent University. She also earned her Ed. D. in Higher Education Administration from Oral Roberts University. She may be reached at malivingston@oru.edu.

Dr. Janet George is an adjunct Assistant Professor at Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, OK and a certified Master Reviewer with Quality Matters. She earned a B.A. in History from the University of Madras, India, a B. Ed from Indira Gandhi University, India, an M.A. in English Literature from the University of Madras, India, and an Ed. D. in Higher Education Administration (2016) from Oral Roberts University. She may be reached at jageorge@oru.edu.