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ABSTRACT

The study aimed at investigating the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance at Africa International University. Investigation was made to find out whether international students’ experiences of culture shock affected their academic performance. The study also sought to determine the major causes and effects of culture shock for international students. In relation to that, an inquiry was also launched to see whether international students’ experiences of culture shock affected their student-teacher relationships out of the classrooms. Moreover, the study probed whether demographic variables such as gender, age, and country of origin affected international students’ experiences of culture shock. The findings of this study are significant to school administrators and policy makers at Africa International University and other Universities that have opened their doors to international students.

A closed-ended questionnaire was used to collect data. The instruments were administered by the researcher to 100 participants in the study. The study employed the random sampling method to select respondents. Pearson’s Correlation Test was used to test the relationships between the variables in the hypotheses. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 22.0) was the software used to analyze the data. The statistical significance value (P ≤ 0.05) was used to reject or accept the null hypotheses.

Findings of this study revealed that the major causes of culture shock for international students are: language barrier, Host students’ attitudes toward international students, AIU’s educational system, food, Kenyan immigration policies, and too much course work. Over 50% of respondents identified the above constructs to be causes of culture shock for them. The major effects of culture shock identified by respondents are: homesickness, social withdrawal, inability to cope with the language of instruction, difficulty in adapting to the teaching methods at AIU, and challenges in adjusting to rigorous library research. Again, over 50% identified these constructs as effects of culture shock they experienced. International students who experienced high to very high degrees of culture shock had poor academic performance. This is evident as 93.5% of respondents who reported their experiences of culture shock as high had a GPA range of 2.0 -2.5. In addition, 89% of respondents with very high degree of culture shock had a GPA range of 2.0-2.5. Females experienced higher degree of culture shock than their male counterparts as the percentage of females was 73% compared to 4.4% of males. Younger international students under age 30 were more likely to experience very high degrees of culture shock than their older counterparts of the age 30 and above. International students from the USA, Ethiopia, Liberia, and Nigeria experienced higher degrees of culture shock than international students from other countries. Over 50% of respondents from these countries rated their experiences of culture shock as very high. Finally, the experience of culture shock affected international students’ and teachers’ relationships as 93.3% of respondents who reported experiencing culture shock reported that they never interacted with teachers out of the classrooms.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Culture shock has been a subject of much investigation for many years because of its effects on both education and the workplace. International students and foreigners who are employees in a new culture experience culture shock. In an academic setting, culture shock has effects on academic performance. The effects may be devastating (Miller and Green 2008, 26). For example, international students might not easily understand the lessons because of language barriers, unfamiliar learning and teaching technologies, and professors’ teaching methods which could cause a lack of interest in learning, thus leading to poor academic performance.

Culture shock is different from its causes. It is the reaction to uncomfortable exposure to things such as new environments, new faces, and adaptation to exotic and non-exotic customs. Being apart from important people in one’s life, such as family, friends, colleagues, or teachers, may make people feel uncomfortable when such familiar scenes, sounds, or atmospheres disappear. Some of the behavioral responses include social withdrawal, homesickness, hostility, loss of appetite for food, and poor academic performance (Lai 2011, 115).

Background of the Study

“Culture shock is defined as the mental strain and anxiety resulting from contact with a new culture and the feelings of loss, confusion, and impotence, which are due to loss of accustomed cultural cues and social rules” (Baier 2005, 11). Anyone
can exhibit culture shock. International students are faced with the challenges of culture shock and these challenges can have effects on their academic performance.

International students may respond to their experiences of culture shock by resorting to social withdrawal, home sickness, lack of appetite for food, hostilities toward host’ culture or by being reluctant to study their lessons etc. Such actions may hinder their academic performance.

Studies have shown that culture shock affects international students’ academic performance. A study conducted by Andrew C. Pelling on international students in Canada showed that Canada’s individualistic culture caused a serious culture shock to international students. They were socially withdrawn from social activities. It affected their academic performance in that the teachers created an impersonal environment inside and outside the classroom. They never had the opportunity to discuss with teachers about academic matters (Pelling 2000, 34).

Another study conducted by M. Hellsten on international students attending schools in Australia showed that many international students were not accustomed to the problem-based style of teaching and learning preferred in Australia. The process that led to their adjustment of such teaching style was very uncomfortable. This is an example of teaching methods causing culture shock for students (Hellsten 2002, 8).

With this background, this study intends to examine critically the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance at Africa International University.

Statement of the Problem

Africa International University (AIU) has a diverse students’ population. It has students from various cultural backgrounds from Africa, Europe, America, Asia etc.
All these students bring with them their cultural memes to the University. Therefore, AIU’s academic setting has become multicultural. When students travel to another country for an academic purpose, they are greeted with culture shock.

This phenomenon is unavoidable. Diversity may pose major challenges to international students studying in a foreign academic institution. Among these challenges are difficulties in speaking and understanding both the language of instruction and host nationals’ local language(s), academic underperformance, inability to cope with educational technologies, and withdrawal from social activities.

This research was an inquiry into the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance at Africa International University.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to provide information about the experience of cultural shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance and to recommend practical ways to AIU’s administration and the international student body as to how to reduce the experience of culture shock, thereby enhancing the academic performance of international students. This quest was guided by careful investigation and interpretation of information.

Significance of the Study

The importance of the study was it provided findings that can aid teachers, administrators, and researchers in fashioning effective policies and methods that will help international students overcome culture shock. The findings will aid teachers in designing teaching methods that will be better suited to meeting the needs of international students. Administrators will be able to develop effective orientation
programs that will reduce cultural shock for international students. Researchers will be able to develop theories that will attempt to explain some phenomena of culture shock. In addition, school policy makers will be able to use knowledge obtained from this research to fashion effective policies that will be favorable to international students. The research findings will also enable the church to design effective evangelization and missional strategies that will be able to meet the needs of international students who come from diverse cultural backgrounds.

Research Objectives

The following general objective and specific objectives were formulated in order to guide the researcher in maintaining the focus of the research.

General Objective

To critically examine the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance at AIU

Specific Objectives

To find out the major or primary causes and effects of the experience of culture shock for international students at AIU

To probe whether demographic variables such as gender, age, and country of origin affect international students’ experiences of culture shock

To examine whether international students’ experience of culture shock affects student-teacher relationships out of the classroom

Research Questions (RQ)
RQ1. What are the major or primary causes of culture shock for international students at Africa International University?
RQ2. What are the major or primary effects of culture shock for international students at Africa International University?
RQ3. How do demographic factors (specifically gender, age, and country of origin) affect the experience of culture shock at Africa International University?
RQ4. How does the experience of culture shock affects international students’ academic performance at Africa International University?
RQ5. How does the experience of culture shock affects student-teacher relationships out of the classroom at Africa International University?

Hypotheses

Hypotheses were not posited for RQ1 and RQ2 of this study. Information gathered about these research questions was reported as descriptive findings. The following hypotheses in null form were framed to provide answers to RQ3, RQ4 and RQ5.

RQ3: How do demographic factors (specifically gender, age, and country of origin) affect the experience of culture shock?

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between gender and the experience of culture shock

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between age and the experience of culture shock

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between country of origin and the experience of culture shock
RQ4: How does the experience of culture shock affect international students’ academic performance at AIU?

H₀₄: Students’ experience of culture shock does not significantly affect their academic performance

RQ5: How does the experience of culture shock affect student-teacher relationships out of the classroom at AIU?

H₀₅: Students’ experience of culture shock does not significantly affect student-teacher relationships out of the classroom.

Delimitations of the Study

“Delimitations define the scope of the study. The scope may focus on specific variables or a central phenomenon, delimited to specific participants or sites, or narrowed to one type of research design” (Creswell 2003, 148). This study focused its attention on the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance at Africa International University. Only college students who are at the undergraduate and graduate levels and are also international were participants of this study.

Limitations of the Study

“Limitations are those conditions beyond the control of the researcher that may place restrictions on the conclusions of the study and their application to other situations” (Best and Kahn 2006, 38). The researcher did not study the entire international graduate and undergraduate students instead a sample of international students was drawn from the total international students enrolled at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The results of this study were generalized to represent all international undergraduate and graduate students at Africa International University.
In addition, the researcher was aware that there could be other factors that could cause the experience of culture shock for international students that may not have been covered in this research.

Operational Definitions of Key Terms

**Culture Shock** - “is a transitional phenomenological experience encountered by individuals because they find themselves unable to use known and familiar cultural references to understand, convey and validate central aspects of their identity in a new culture” (Cameron and Kirkman 2010, 2).

**Acculturation** - “is the dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members” (Berry 2005).

**Self-efficacy** - “refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands” (Wood and Bandura 1989, 408).

Conceptual Framework

“Conceptual framework is defined as a visual or written product, one that explains, either graphically or in narrative form, the main things to be studied—the key factors, concepts, or variables—and the presumed relationships among them” (Miles and Huberman 1994, 18). This definition sets in motion the conceptual framework of this study.

In keeping with the research questions and the null hypotheses of this study, the researcher investigated culture shock as a phenomenon. The researcher identified the major or primary causes of culture shock at Africa International University. In
addition, the researcher identified the effects of culture shock for international students at Africa International University.

Second, in line with stated research question three, the researcher investigated the effects of demographic factors such as gender, age, and country of origin on the experience of culture shock. The null hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 have already stated that there is no relationship between the stated demographic factors and culture shock. However, the null hypothesis was tested to confirm or reject their claims.

Third, the researcher investigated the effects of the experience of culture shock on international students’ academic performance in line with research question four and hypothesis 4. This is the primary objective of this study. The stated null hypothesis 4 assumes that there is no relationship between the variables of culture shock and academic performance. The null hypothesis was tested to confirm or reject its claim.

Lastly, the researcher investigated the effects of culture shock on international student-teacher relationships at Africa International University. This was done in keeping with research question five and the null hypothesis 5 of this study.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter focuses on the critical review of the relevant literature that underscores this study. This review is divided into eight parts: Definition and stages of culture shock, theoretical framework of culture shock, scholars’ disagreement on the use of the term “culture shock”, factors that cause culture shock for international students, effects of culture shock on academic performance, psychosocial dimension of culture shock, gaps in the literature (i.e., the weaknesses of the literature surveyed and the limitation of relevant studies of culture shock on international students from Africa and within Africa), and biblical integration of the research topic.

Definition of Culture Shock and Stages

The concept of culture shock has been interpreted in a variety of ways, both by people who have experienced it and by anthropologists studying it. “Culture shock is a transitional phenomenological experience encountered by individuals because they find themselves unable to use known and familiar cultural references to understand, convey, and validate central aspects of their identity in a new culture” (Cameron and Kirkman 2010, 2). The term ‘culture shock’ was coined by renowned anthropologist Kalervo Oberg in a speech he gave in Rio de Janeiro (Rempel, n.d.).

In the article entitled “Culture Shock-One of Common Problems in Intercultural Communication”, Wang Mingli gave four stages of culture shock. These four stages are ways in which people make attempt to interpret the phenomenon of culture shock.
The first stage is called the “honey moon” stage. In this stage, you are excited about living in a different place and everything seems to be marvelous. The amusement of life in a new culture seems to have no ending. International students at Africa International University upon their arrival feel excited that they have entered a new country and are going to interact with people of different culture thereby enriching their experiences. Visiting shopping malls and other entertainment places were some of the ways of experiencing the honey moon stage of culture shock. However, this stage of culture shock does not last forever. After a period of time, international students begin to experience the second stage of culture shock called the “hostility stage”.

In the hostility stage, international students begin to notice that not everything is as good as they had originally thought it was. They become tired of many things about the new culture. Some may dislike the food, others may not understand the host language, and yet others may not be able to cope with the new academic environment. Moreover, the host students don’t treat them like guests anymore. They are not greeted or visited like before. Everything that seemed to be so wonderful at first is now awful, and everything makes them feel distressed and tired (Mingli 2015, 71–74).

The third stage is called “recovery”. In this stage, the bad feelings start to go away. In addition, international students try to acquire understanding of some of the host’s cultural practices. Their conditions start to change and the environment becomes more satisfactory, the international students recover from the symptoms of the first two stages and adjust themselves to the new standards, values and even beliefs and traditions of the new culture. They eventually realized that there are elements in the host’s culture that can be appreciated (Mingli 2015, 71–74).
With this knowledge, they approach the last stage of culture shock called “adjustment”. During this stage, international students arrived at a point where they actually feel good because they have acquired a great deal of knowledge and understand about the new culture. The things that used to make them feel uncomfortable or weird are now things that they understand. This understanding eases much of the stress. Now, they feel comfortable, and have adjusted to the host culture (Mingli 2015, 71–74).

Disagreement over the Negative Characterization of the term “Culture Shock”

Kent Doebr McLeod in his dissertation pointed out that several initial researchers in the arena of culture shock research have followed Oberg in defining culture shock as a sickness. They identify this phenomenon as an unavoidable mental illness in which the unaware victim becomes annoyed and dejected. In addition, they emphasize that culture shock is a disease similar to schizophrenia due to the international students’ craving to avoid menacing social encounters with members of the host culture while erecting defensive mechanisms to blunt the impact of the stresses (McLeod 2008, 20).

McLeod asserts:

The depiction of culture shock as fundamentally negative, however, has been called into question by some scholars who view this phenomenon as potentially a positive experience. Weaver (1994), for example, does not perceive culture shock as an illness or a disease, and consequently, does not hold that this transition is entirely harmful. While acknowledging the stress inherent in the adjustment for international students, the researcher also highlights the opportunities for personal growth and discovery that culture shock creates. Individuals who successfully navigate the course of adjustment to the host culture often emerge with a greater sense of esteem, confidence, and awareness. (McLeod 2008, 28)
The term “shock” has been dismissed by some researchers because they think it lacks psychological and cultural theory. Zheng and Berry renamed culture shock as acculturative stress and state that it is a kind of stress in which the causes are identified as having their basis in the process of acculturation. A set of specific stress behaviors accompany acculturation. These stress behaviors are feelings of being marginalized and alienated, intensified psychosomatic symptom level, depressed mental health status, and identity confusion (Yue and Le 2012, 135).

Furthermore, Berry gave two reasons for substituting culture shock with acculturative stress. First, he argued that the concept of shock lean towards negativity, while stress may have both positive and negative characteristics. Therefore, the term stress suits the concept of acculturation since cultural adjustment is a process containing both positive and negative experiences. Lastly, he argued that acculturation is an appropriate term since cultural adaptation consists of contacts between two cultures. Culture, he said, is a concept that has one context (Yue and Le 2012, 135).

Nevertheless, the original term “culture shock” remains the most widely used and recognized description, owing perhaps more to the initial coinage of this experience and linguistic impact than to conceptual accuracy (McLeod 2008, 21).

Theoretical Framework of Culture Shock

There are a lot of theories that explain culture shock. The following theories are current theories formulated by researchers to explain this phenomenological experience. Yuefang Zhou, Divya Jindal-Snape, Keith Topping, and John Todman in their article entitled “Theoretical models of culture shock and adaptation in international students in higher education” discussed the following theories:
Culture Learning Theory

The social or culture learning model is strongly advocated by some researchers for its theoretical strength and it also leads to training methods (Furham and Bochner 1986 as cited in Zhou et al. 2008). Culture learning theory originated from social psychology, concentrating mainly on behavioral aspects of intercultural relations and regarding social interaction as a skilled and communally organized performance. ‘Shock’ is understood as the stimulus for obtaining specific culture related skills that are essential to engage in new social intercourse (Argyle 1969 as cited in Zhou et al. 2008).

Zhou and others conclude that:

The process of adaptation is influenced by a number of variables, including: language or communication competence, quantity and quality of contact with host nationals, general knowledge about a new culture, previous experience abroad, cultural distance, length of residence in the host culture, friendship networks, cultural identity, acculturation modes, temporary versus permanent residence in a new country, and cross-cultural training. This model leads to practical guidelines for intervention in preparation, orientation and (especially) behavioral social skills training. (Zhou et al. 2008, 65)

Stress, Coping and Adjustment Theory

The stress, coping, and adjustment theory emphasizes the fact that people engaging in cross-cultural encounters need to be strong, adapt, and develop coping strategies and tactics. “Adjustment is regarded as an active process of managing stress at different systemic levels – both individual and situational. Relevant variables include personality factors, situational factors such as social support, and degree of life change. Intervention methods are likely to include stress management strategy training” (Zhou et al. 2008, 65).
Acculturation and Identity Theory

The acculturation and identity theory considers three models of acculturation: one-dimensional, two-dimensional and categorical. The one-dimensional idea of acculturation suggests assimilation. International students slowly give up their original cultural identity and move towards identification with the host’s culture (Zhou et al. 2008, 67). On the contrary, the two-dimensional approach is a well-adjusted model of acculturation and identity – immigrants and sojourner and refugee groups develop dual cultural identity (Zhou et al. 2008, 67). Some international students have the fear of losing their original cultural identity and also fear being alienated if they do adapt to the host culture. In this case, they tend to strike a balance between their culture of origin and the host culture. Therefore, they are in the two-dimensional state.

The categorical model recognizes four modes of acculturation: integration, separation, assimilation and marginalization. “Integration means that international students perceive themselves as high in both host and home culture identifications; separation implies that they perceive themselves as high in home culture identification but low in host culture identification; assimilation means that they see themselves as high in host culture identification but low in home culture identification; and marginalization suggests that they perceive themselves as low in both home and host culture identifications” (Berry 1994 as cited in Zhou et al. 2008).

Social Identity Theory

The social identity theory developed from social psychology. It looks at how group association impacts a person’s identity and reflects on two characteristics. The first characteristic is the role of social classification and social assessment in relation
to self-confidence, coupled with in-group bias and out-group prejudice. The other characteristic is the diverse effects of specific cross-cultural diversity (e.g. individualism-collectivism) on group association, perceptions and interactions. Related research includes work on avoiding or reducing doubts, which requires the ability to forecast and explain one’s own conduct and that of others during interactions. This considers the role of knowledge of the host culture, attitudes toward hosts and host attitudes toward international students, and degree of cultural similarity (Zhou et al. 2008, 68).

Even though the above theories contained relevant information about the phenomenon of culture shock, they do not provide the whole picture of this phenomenon. These theories are limited in that they do not address the principal focus of this study, which is the relationship between the experience of culture shock and the academic performance of international students. There is nothing mentioned in these theories about new teaching methods and students’ learning styles which have significant and direct implications for international students’ academic performance.

Factors that cause Culture Shock for International Students

Numerous studies have been done on the causes of culture shock for international students. Let us consider a few which will be followed by a brief critique.

Stephen H. Miller and Sharon Green (2008) at California State University investigated the causes of culture shock among international students of various nationalities. They drew up a questionnaire that had thirteen causes of culture shock (1) Language, (2) Interpersonal Communication (body language, facial expressions), (3) Politics, (4) Mentality (mental attitude) (5) Religion, (6) American’s Attitude
towards International Students, (7) Infrastructure, (8) Service Quality, (9) Education System, (10) Food, (11) Environmental Concerns, (12) Social Responsibility, and (13) Immigration Policies. The questionnaire was administered online. Their sample size was 191 international students. The 13 elements of culture shock that international students were asked to consider as causes of culture shock were analyzed by assigning a score ranging from 1 for “Strongly Disagree”, to 5 for “Strongly Agree”. The higher the score, the greater was the student’s agreement that the element was a cause of their culture shock. These were their findings: Fifty percent or greater of the respondents who indicated “Slightly Agree” and “Strongly Agree” to the causes of culture shock are as follows:

(1) Language – 64%
(2) Immigration Policies – 61%
(3) Mentality (Mental attitude) – 60%
(4) Education System – 58%
(5) Interpersonal Communication (Body Language, Facial Expressions) – 58%
(6) Food – 57%

In regard to the causes of culture shock, they concluded that different students also had different reasons for experiencing culture shock. The differences were significant among students from different regions. South East Asia and East European students reported that their culture shock was mainly caused by Language. South East Asian and African students had more difficulties in Interpersonal Communication. American’s Attitude towards International Students was cited as the major cause by students from South East Asia only. East and West Europe and students from Africa reported that Politics and Mentality were the major causal elements (Miller and Green 2008, 26–37).
In addition to the above finding, the study also showed that there was no significant difference between males and females in the degree to which respondents encountered culture shock. This is somewhat surprising given that gender is often a significant moderating variable (Miller and Green 2008, 26–37).

Contrary to their findings, Miller and Green cited the research of Stedham and Yamamura (2004) which found that the level of culture shock experienced varies by gender. Women were reported to have experienced high levels of culture shock because they tend to be more relationship oriented with strong emphasis on interaction, communication, and harmony. This statement in turn suggests that women are more likely than men to experience internal issues of cultural differences (Miller and Green 2008, 26–37).

Findings from the research done by Miller and Green also revealed that younger students had encountered more culture shock than the older students. This follows logically from the assumption that graduate students are older than undergraduates.

The younger international students identified the inability to communicate interpersonally with host nationals to be the leading cause of their high levels of culture shock experiences (2008, 26–37).

The findings of this research are not convincing because of the method of questionnaire distribution (by internet). Distributing questionnaires by internet hamper the accuracy of the findings of the research due to the below disadvantages.

The researcher cannot differentiate whether there were many respondents at one computer address, or if one respondent was answering many questionnaires from a lot of computers. The two major disadvantages of this method are sample frame and non-response biases. Sample frame bias is the non-random omission of individuals
from the sample frame. The researcher may remove important participants from the research due to the fact that they do not have access to the internet or computer. Non-response bias is the bias introduced when respondents with in the sample frame have very different attitudes or demographic characteristics to those who do not respond (Fleming and Bowden 2009, 4).

With the weaknesses cited in this empirical research, its findings cannot invalidate the stated hypothesis one (There is no significant relationship between gender and the experience of culture shock), hypothesis two (There is no significant relationship between age and the experience of culture shock) and hypothesis three (There is no significant relationship between country of origin and the experience of culture shock) of this study.

In addition to the above research, another ethnographic research was conducted by Lorraine Brown and Immy Holloway (2008) at a university in the South of England. The aim of the research was to investigate the adjustment journey of international postgraduate students. The research was qualitative. The researchers used interviews and participant observation over a 12-month academic year. Their sample size was comprised of thirteen (13) international postgraduate students. Their findings revealed that culture shock for international students was caused by a lot of factors which included nervousness, depression, excitement, British drinking behavior, homesickness, loneliness, and stress (Brown and Holloway 2008, 33–49).

The sample size of this research is very small to make the general conclusion that the stated factors are indeed causes of culture shock for international students at that University. A quantitative approach that requires a large sample size would have made a tremendous difference in the findings. Furthermore, nervousness, depression,
excitement, and homesickness are not causes of culture shock. These are effects rather than causes.

Finally, another qualitative study conducted by Arline Edwards-Joseph and Stanley B. Baker (2012) investigated whether or not Caribbean overseas students attending universities in the United States, perceived that they experienced culture shock and what themes emerged explaining their experiences. They collected a sample size of seventy-two Caribbean overseas college students who grew up in the Caribbean. There were 44 women and 28 men with age range from 18 to 41. A modified grounded theory approach was utilized to analyze the data. Only the participants’ main concerns regarding their levels of culture shock were sought.

A 22 question demographic questionnaire, consisting of multiple choice questions, Likert scale questions, and open questions was designed by the principal investigator for the purpose of the study. Their findings indicated that "thirty eight participants reported having experienced symptoms of culture shock while in the US and 20 reported not experiencing symptoms. One participant reported some uncertainty about symptoms stating yes and no, while another's response could not be determined as yes or no" (Edwards-Joseph and Baker 2012, 716–29). “Through coding and analysis of the data, the following five major themes emerged for participants who experienced culture shock loneliness and feelings of not fitting in, anxiety and depression, value system and cultural differences, cultural identity, and environmental factors” (Edwards-Joseph and Baker 2012, 716–29).

The study mentioned that 44 women and 28 men with age range from 18 to 41 were participants of the study. This implies that gender and age should have been
considered. A major weakness of this research is its failure to provide a descriptive information of how the variables gender and age are affected by the symptoms of culture shock. Since the focus of the research was to investigate the levels of culture shock experienced by participants, it would have been very important to consider the participants’ gender and age.

The weaknesses found in this study cannot invalidate the following hypotheses. Hypothesis one (There is no significant relationship between gender and the experience of culture shock) and hypothesis two (There is no significant relationship between age and the experience of culture shock).

Effects of Culture Shock on International Students’ Academic Performance

Learning a new culture and learning in a new culture which may have different beliefs and values can be a difficult situation subjected to international students (Dee and Henkin 1999, 54-70). They need to struggle with unfamiliar social and educational establishments, behaviors and expectations as well as dealing with the problems of adjustment common to students in general. This is more difficult when international students are unaware and falsely accept that the new society functions like their home countries. They become lost in the transition process (Zhou et al. 2008, 63).

The difficulties experienced by international students in a new culture are expressed in the below researches. A quantitative study conducted by Philip Kelly and Yvonne Moogan (2012) at Liverpool Business School, England was intended to improve our understanding of internationally mobile students (IMS) transition period and to explore possible causes of and practical responses to the differences in academic performance relating to the IMS and home country students engaged in
postgraduate studies. The data used for this study was collected from the Oracle Student System database of information. The data was comprised of 2,159 Master of Business Administration (MBA) students enrolled at Liverpool Business School and registered during the last ten years (from 1999 to 2009).

The sample comprised 78% international mobile students and 75% were males. Their findings showed that home country students performed significantly better than international students, although the latter performed better in examinations than in coursework. A possible cause for their underperformance was culture shock which was reflected in their inability to cope with new teaching styles and a new learning environment (Kelly and Moogan 2012, 24–46).

The first weakness of this study is that it fails to provide readers any information about the statistical test used in analyzing the data. Readers cannot know whether a correlation, causal comparative, Chi-square, and t-test etc. were used to analyze the data collected. Second, as a quantitative study, it should have provided information about the level of statistical significance needed to accept or reject the hypothesis. There is no level of statistical significance mentioned in the study. Third, the expression “a possible cause” found in the last sentence of the report signifies that the underperformance of international students could have been related to other factors not specifically culture shock. These factors are not mentioned. Finally, we cannot be sure that inability to cope with new teaching styles and a new learning environment were effects of culture shock on their academic performance as the data used were not current with the date of the research. The research was conducted in 2012 and data used were gathered from the year 1999-2009. With the weaknesses pointed out from this empirical study, the stated hypotheses 4 of this research which
states “students’ experience of culture shock does not significantly affect their academic performance” need not be rejected.

Another study investigated Malaysian students in the American basic speech class and was aimed at discovering which areas they find most difficult and to discover the causes of these difficulties. Malaysian students were chosen as the focus of the study because Asian students comprise more than half of the total foreign student population (56%), in America and Malaysians constitute one of the largest groups among the Asian student groups (Snyder1992 as cited in Yook 1995).

Ethnography was chosen as the study’s principal approach because of its ability to provide ‘thick description’. A total of 11 interviews were carried out with 2 major groups--Malays and Chinese Malaysians. Findings showed that Malaysians had at least three main handicaps in a speech class: (1) they had a language barrier; (2) they came from a culture in which gesturing and speaking loudly are frowned upon; and (3) they had no experience in their own countries speaking publicly. Interviews also led to suggestions about how to help Malaysian students in speech classes. Schools could offer helpful classes in English. Instructors could coach students individually, and take their disadvantages into account when evaluating them (Yook 1995, 1-31).

The first weakness of the study is that the name of the school where the research was conducted is not known. We cannot conduct background investigation of its findings because the school’s name is not known. Moreover, the sample size was not large enough to make such generalization about Malaysian students given the information that Malaysian students are one of the largest groups of Asian students in America. We do not know the total population of Malaysian students at that unknown school and the researcher failed to provide such important information.
Based on the weaknesses of this study, the stated hypothesis 3 (There is no significant relationship between country of origin and the experience of culture shock) and hypothesis 4 (Students’ experience of culture shock does not significantly affect their academic performance) of this research need not be rejected.

**Psychosocial Dimension of Culture Shock**

According to Junzi Xia, change and unfamiliarity influence international students’ psychological adjustment when they come in contact with a new culture (Xia 2009, 98).

Culture shock has negative effects on a person’s psychological well-being and often includes a large and diverse set of symptoms. However, not everyone will experience all the symptoms; almost all people will experience some parts. Some early symptoms may include depression, anxiety and feelings of helplessness. If these symptoms accrue, the amount and extent of psychological confusion may be profound so that people may have challenges in paying attention to the learning of new cultural skills and traditions (Xia 2009, 98).

Furthermore, these accrued symptoms may affect people’s abilities to solve problems and to make decisions. This decreases the motivation for adapting to the new conditions. Therefore, it appears that dealing with mental stress caused by culture shock is important for those people who come into contact with a foreign culture (Xia 2009, 100).

In order to decrease psychological stress, international students have to make many preparations for culture shock before they go abroad. This period is usually called pre-departure. It is essential and indispensable. If a person is able to make good use of this stage, the psychological impact of culture shock will decrease obviously
(Cushner 1994, 50). Xia proposed three approaches to reduce psychological stress: self-efficacy and optimism, accepting new culture, and seeking social support.

**Self-efficacy and Optimism**

The word self-efficacy means the belief of people that they can overcome the challenges encountered in their lives. They work harder and are not worried when coping with academics or other issues of life, because they have the assurance that they will achieve self-actualization. Nevertheless, international students with low self-efficacy often believe that they cannot perform well. Lack of confidence could be the most important reason for their failure (Aronson, Wilson, and Akert 2005 as cited in Xia 2009). Therefore, self-efficacy plays a key role in decreasing anxiety and overcoming obstacles.

Optimism is also necessary in reducing the anxiety that comes with culture shock. This has been proven through scientific research made by Tim Wilson and Patricia Linville in the 1980s. Optimism enables international students to improve in their coping with culture shock while pessimism can create a spirit of self-doubt leading to international students’ failure to cope with the experiences of culture shock. However, it is difficult for a number of international students in the process of cultural adaptation, since people’s personalities are diverse (Xia 2009, 99).

**Acceptance of New Culture**

The second method is acceptance, which means accepting other cultures’ values and behaviors as not good or bad but simply different. Once people are able to accept them, they will be more comfortable and able to minimize psychological stress. Nevertheless, it is not an easy method. International students need to understand with great willingness and pleasure not only what their host does and believes, but also
why they do it. Therefore, interest, curiosity and willingness are essential, and reluctant acceptance will cause more psychological discomfort (Phillips 2003 as cited in Xia 2009).

To accept all the parts of a different culture is very difficult. Under this condition, tolerance and keeping an open mind toward the local culture may be easier than willing acceptance. In addition, making an attempt to respect local customs and traditions may be also a relatively easy way, which could be a prerequisite for the acceptance of the new culture (Ferraro 2006 as cited in Xia 2009).

Social Support

Social support is also regarded as an effective way of dealing with psychological stress. This means people receive consolation, care, encouragement, advice, approval and help from others around them. Reduction of social support increases depression, anxiety and feelings of helplessness. Research in various cultures provides evidence for the importance of social support. People who live in cultures that stress communal relationships suffer less from mental stress than people who live in cultures that emphasize individualism. Therefore, social support plays a role in reducing possible negative side effects of being in an unfamiliar culture (Lafreniere and Cramer 2005 as cited in Xia 2009).

People who are able to develop friendly relationships with local nationals will get more social support easily, whereas others who are not good at social intercourse may fail to do this. Therefore, they often seek social support through other ways. They may use communication technologies such as cell phones and computers to communicate to families and relatives at home. By this means their senses of security may be reassured. Additionally, depression, anxiety and feelings of helplessness may
be reduced, because people usually feel that they can freely express fears and stress and comfortably receive encouragement and support from relatives and other familiar people back home (Scheyvens 2003 as cited in Xia 2009).

Understanding the psychosocial dimension of culture shock is very important if we are to eradicate its harmful effects on academic performance. Though the literature provides invaluable understanding about the psychosocial adjustments to the effects of culture shock, it fails to specifically address how students’ and teachers’ relationships can be affected by culture shock. In an academic setting like that of Africa International University, students and teachers relationships need to be a priority because it is crucial to the academic performance of students in general and specifically international students. This is the weakness of this section of the literature review. Therefore, the stated hypothesis five of this research which states: Students’ experience of culture shock does not significantly affect student-teacher relationships need not be rejected.

Gaps in the Literature

The literature surveyed fails to invalidate the stated hypotheses of this research. It weaknesses were shown in its failure to address the focus of this research which is to investigate the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance. The empirical studies noted had weaknesses in method of questionnaire distribution, sample size, and the absence of data analysis methods. Therefore, their findings are not convincing based on the above weaknesses. Specifically, the literature fails to address the effects of the experience of culture shock on student-teachers relationships.
Moreover, there are very limited relevant studies investigating the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students from Africa. There are also limited relevant studies conducted among African students leaving from one African country to study in another African country. Taking into consideration the huge cultural differences that exist on the African continent, it is of paramount importance that researchers investigate the experience of culture shock and its effects on students who are entering schools and cultures that are different from their places of nativity.

“Currently, most of the research studies in the professional literature about foreign students regarding their psychosocial, cultural adjustment, and academic needs in the United States refer to Asian students (e.g., India, China, Korea, and Japan). This is not surprising since, according to The Open Doors, 2010 fact sheet, published by the Institute of International Education, in January 2010, there were 435,667 international students from the Asian region attending various universities throughout the United States. The region having the second highest number of students, 85,084, is Europe with a 350,583 difference in student attendance from those coming from the Asian region” (Edwards-Joseph and Baker 2012, 716).

All the weaknesses of the literature review and specifically the empirical studies noted justify the undertaking of this research. The research used relevant and accurate methods of collecting and analyzing data along with a large sample size to give precise information and description of the relationship between international students’ academic performance and the experience of culture shock.
Biblical Integration of the Research Topic

This section of the literature review has no bearings on the research hypotheses and questions. It discusses the culture shock experience that exists when Christian missionaries encounter a new culture other than their own, and how they can cope with it. It is the biblical integration of the research topic. As a reminder, this research is about the relationship between academic performance and the experience of culture shock.

Jesus in Matthew 28:19 -20 (ESV) commanded his disciples to “go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you. And behold, I am with you always, to the end of the age”.

This is a missional call to all Christians to evangelize the world regardless of cultural differences. Jesus was quite aware of the culture differences that exist among people of different nations, but because of his love for humanity, he broke down cultural barriers that can serve as hindrance to the spread of the Gospel. In John chapter 4, Jesus’ encounter with the Samaritan woman is a clear example of breaking down cultural barriers to preach the gospel. The Jews and the Samaritans could not intermingle. It was culturally forbidden for a Jew to interact with a Samaritan. Instead of yielding to the culture shock experienced through his encounter with the Samaritan woman, Jesus used his experience as an opportunity to minister to the woman. Jesus avoided ethnocentrism and he accepted the culture of the Samaritans for we are told in the story he stayed two days in Samaria. The gospel can spread rapidly when missionaries accept the culture of their host and use it as a contact point for sharing the gospel.
However, Christian missionaries spreading the gospel have not always tolerated culture shock as Jesus did. Their views of culture shock were totally negative. Viera Vilhanova in her article entitled “Christian Missionary Enterprise in Africa. A Synonym for Cultural Imperialism?,” stated that the missionary enterprise became a part of the European involvement in Africa and shared the general Western negative image of Africans as inherently ignorant, savage and inferior to Europeans (Vilhanova 2002, 49–68). These early missionaries to Africa could not tolerate the culture shock. Instead, they became ethnocentric by thinking that their culture is superior to African culture. They began to ridicule the cultural practices of Africans.

In his article entitled, “Historical Manifestation of Ethnocentrism and its Challenges Today” Daniel asserts:

During the Colonial Era, some African communities during missionaries’ evangelization were given conditional baptism because the Europeans could not ascertain if they were human beings because they were too black. Conditional baptism goes like “If you are a human being I baptize you in the name…” The earliest anthropologists, who preceded the colonial masters, came out to prove that their cultures were superior. (2011, 10)

All these accounts portray early Western Christian missionaries’ inability to cope with perceived culture shock encountered during their missionary expeditions to Africa. Ethnocentrism comes as a result of an individual inability to cope with the culture shock encounter from a foreign culture. The pivotal question we need to address is: How can Christians today deal with culture shock in propagating the gospel?

Ways for Christian Missionaries to overcome Culture Shock

Former mission professor Kane 1973, as cited by Anna-Marie Lockard in her thesis, concurs that one of the greatest mistakes of the nineteenth century was the
average missionary’s failure to appreciate and demonstrate respect for things foreign; whether customs, cultures, values, or virtues. Rather, they were seen as “strange” and therefore inferior. He states that anthropology more than any other discipline would have assisted in correcting the extreme ethnocentric characteristic of Western mission corp workers deployed to various countries of the world (Lockard 2006, 15).

Christians who are propagating the gospel in different cultures should have cultural anthropological training in order to deal with ethnocentrism that derives from culture shock. Cultural anthropology enables Christians to accept the cultures of people without ethnocentrism. They will be able to accept people and their culture the way they are and not necessarily good or bad but unique.

Another way Christians can overcome culture shock is through psychosocial adjustments. Accepting people behaviors the way they are and at the same time socializing with them can play a vital role in overcoming culture shock. Do not judge people behaviors and actions through your cultural lens.

Lastly, developing better communication skills is necessary in overcoming culture shock. Try as much to learn some aspects of the host culture such as language, mannerism and body language as these will help you communicate better with your host thereby enabling you to communicate the gospel message freely.

The accomplishments of Christian missions hinge on the quality of the relationships between cross-cultural workers and the people to whom they serve.

Heibert asserts:

The biblical model of incarnation will be the tool to bridge the cultural gap. To bridge the cultural gap between heaven and earth, God became human and dwelt among us, eating our food, speaking our language, and suffering our sorrows – yet he did not give up His divine nature. Similarly, incarnation means identification, without denying who we are originally. In fact, it is a bicultural state. Just as God became one with us in order to save us; we must become one with the people to whom we go in order to bring them the message of salvation. (2002, 158)
Our missional call as Christians to evangelize the world should not be underestimated. We can be very effective if we invent means through which culture shock can be overcome. Jesus should be our model in dealing with people from various cultures. He embraced people and transformed them and their way of life through the gospel message.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and explain the methods of collecting and analyzing data. This chapter covers research design, target population, population sample size and sampling procedure, methods of collecting data, ethical considerations, description of research instruments, reliability and validity of research instruments, pilot testing, and data analysis methods.

Research Design

According to Hedrick, Bickman, and Rog, “research design serves as architectural blueprint of a research project. It ensures that the data collection and analysis activities used to conduct the study are tied adequately to the research questions and that the complete research agenda will be addressed. Selection of a design affects the credibility of the research, its usefulness, and its feasibility” (Hedrick, Bickman, and Rog 1993, 32-38). This research has adopted the quantitative approach; thus the survey and descriptive designs are chosen.

The rationale behind the selection of a survey design for this study was to “generalize from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made about some characteristics, attitudes, or behavior of the population. In addition, it is efficient in collecting quantitative data” (Creswell 2003, 154–62).

The descriptive design was chosen to complement the survey design. The rationale for choosing the descriptive design lies in the fact that “it provides a picture of a phenomenon as it naturally occurs” (Hedrick, Bickman, and Rog 1993, 32-44).
Culture shock is a naturally occurring phenomenon; therefore, descriptive design helped the researcher provide a detailed picture of the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance. Furthermore, this research tested hypotheses of a correlational nature which involved summarizing the relationship between two or more variables. Descriptive design was effective in testing such hypotheses (Hedrick, Bickman, and Rog 1993, 32-44).

Target Population

The target population for this research was international students at Africa International University enrolled at the undergraduate and graduate levels of the University. International students participating in this study are from various countries. This study considered international students present on campus and those who live outside of the campus but attend classes regularly, not those who are in different countries doing studies through the blended Online, Distance Education, and Learning (ODEL) modes.

Population Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

The total number of international students was 213 (Current International Students 2016). Of this number, the researcher gathered a sample size of 100 international students. The sampling method or procedure used was random sampling.

“In random sampling, each member of the population under study has an equal chance of being selected and the probability of a member of the population being selected is unaffected by the selection of other members of the population, i. e. each selection is entirely independent of the next. The method involves selecting at random from a list of the population (a sampling frame) the required number of subjects for the sample. Because of probability and chance, the sample should contain subjects
with characteristics similar to the population as a whole; some old, young, tall, short, fit, unfit, rich, poor, etc.” (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison 2000, 100).

Even though random sampling was used to select participants for this study, four (4) countries were omitted from the study due to very small population size. Some had majority of their students at home doing their courses online therefore the phenomenon of culture shock as discussed in the context of this study does not apply to them since they are not in a foreign country. The study considered countries with a student population size of five persons and above. The rationale for selecting countries with a student population size of five persons and above is to have a total sample size that is statistically significant, and also such sample size is appropriate for valid correlational analysis. After the adjustment was done, the countries that qualified for the study are represented in the table below with their individual student populations.

**Table 1 Revised Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The new total population size from which 100 participants were randomly selected was 190. The previous total population of international students at AIU for academic year 2016 was 213 students. For sampling frames that had 10 or fewer students, no sampling was done and all the population was used. Forty percent (40%) of the Nigerian and South Sudanese students’ populations were used in the sample. Fifty percent (50%) of the DRC and Tanzania students’ populations were used in the sample. The researcher did the random sampling process by selecting number 1 as the random start and consequently selected every second entry from the new list of each country sample frame. The process yielded a sample of 100 students as shown in the table below.

**Table 2 Sample Size per Country**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample size for the research was 100.
Data Collection

Data for this study were collected through the administering of questionnaires. The researcher personally administered the questionnaires to avoid discrepancies that might have arisen if another person were to administer the questionnaires. Self-administering the questionnaires to the population has the following advantages: to establish interpersonal relationship with participants, enlighten the participants about the purpose of the study, and provide a vivid clarity of each item in the questionnaire (Best and Kahn 2006, 313).

Ethical Considerations in Research

Academic research is governed by ethical procedures in order to facilitate the smooth functioning of the research process. Researchers and participants should be aware of the ethical demarcations so that no body involved in the research process will be subjected to abuse of any kind.

Maclean and Brookshaw assert:

The principal duty for the conduct of ethical research lies with the researcher. It is a fundamental principle that staff and students engaged in research adopt a continuing personal commitment to act ethically, to encourage ethical behavior in those with whom they collaborate, and to consult where appropriate concerning ethical issues. Researchers have a responsibility to ensure as far as possible that the physical, social and psychological well-being of their research participants is not harmfully affected by the research. Research relationships should be characterized, whenever possible, by mutual respect and trust. Researchers should avoid, wherever possible, actions which may have damaging consequences for other researchers or which might undermine the reputation of their discipline. (MacLean and Brookshaw 2008, 3-4)

In light of this, the researcher conducted this research with the informed consent of the participants. Consent forms were distributed along with the questionnaires. A copy of the consent form can be found in Appendix B. The purpose of the research was stated and anonymity and confidentiality promised to the
participants. To ensure this, none of the questions in the questionnaire asks for the participant’s name. The requisite authorization and approval was pursued and attained from the Graduate School Board of Africa International University. A copy of the letter of authorization is found in Appendix D. The findings of the research were not prejudicial to participants involved.

Description of Research Instrument

The instrument that was used to collect data for the study is a questionnaire. The questionnaire has closed ended questions. Closed ended questions have several advantages. “Closed ended questions are more satisfactory because the task of responding to a given item is more reliable and they constrain the number of possible answers and eliminate rare answers or those not appropriate for the analysis” (Meld 1990, 9).

“Closed ended questions are also better for constructing rating scales which yield ordinal data. Thus, data analysis and interpretation can be far less time-consuming and easier to automate. Furthermore, closed ended questions generally produce more consistent data which can be statistically analyzed. Responses of individuals and groups can be quantified and compared. Thus, closed ended questions not only determine the quality of information or opinion elicited, but also affects data analysis and interpretation” (Meld 1990, 9).

The questionnaire is divided into two parts. Part A and Part B. Part A will collect demographic information like country of origin, gender, and age. Part B will collect information about the causes of culture shock, effects of culture shock, experience of culture shock, international students’ academic performance, and their interactions with teachers. All of these items are related to the research questions. The
instrument was adopted and adapted from a research done on the causes and symptoms of culture shock by Stephen H. Miller and Sharon Green (2008, 26-37). Items 1 and 2 of the questionnaire found in Appendix A were adopted while Items 3, 7 and 8 were adapted. Items 4, 5, 6 and 9 were added by the researcher based on the nature of the research topic. An email was sent to Stephen H. Miller requesting permission to use his instrument, and the permission was granted. A copy of the letter of permission is in Appendix C.

Reliability and Validity of Research Instrument

The success of the data gathering procedure depended on the use of reliable and valid data instruments. Reliability refers to the ability of an instrument to measure whatever it was intended to measure consistently (Best and Kahn 2003, 277). Validity, on the other hand, refers to how well an instrument measures what was intended to be measured (Kombo and Tromp 2006, 97). To establish the reliability and validity of the instrument, the instrument was used by Maliha Nasir in determining the correlation that exists between cultural adjustment and academic achievement. The sample used consisted of 106 international students (48 male students and 58 female students randomly selected) studying in two public universities in Islamabad, Pakistan. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-12) was used for data analysis. The result of the research yielded the following correlation coefficient and statistical significance: \( r = 0.81, P < 0.01 \) (Nasir 2012, 95-103).

The “r-value” is called the correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficient measures the robustness of the relationship between two variables. Pearson’s correlation coefficient is one of the most commonly used correlation coefficient and
measures the linear relationship between two variables. The value of the correlation coefficient, denoted as $r$, ranges from -1 to +1, which gives the strength of the relationship and whether the relationship is negative or positive. When the value of $r$ is greater than zero, it is a positive relationship; when the value is less than zero, it is a negative relationship. A value of zero indicates that there is no relationship between the two variables. The closer the value of $r$ is to +1, the stronger the linear relationship. Such a relationship is a strong positive relationship.

When the value of $r$ is closer to -1, the stronger the linear relationship, but such relationship is a strong negative relationship (Nickolas 2015). In the case above the “r-value” is closer to +1; therefore there is a strong positive relationship between the variables cultural adjustment and academic achievement. As also seen above, the statistical significance value or “p-value” is less than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis of the research which was “there is no significant relationship between cultural adjustment and academic achievement” was rejected. With such a strong positive correlation coefficient and statistical significant of this research, the researcher concluded that the instrument is highly reliable and valid to be used in this study.

Pilot Testing

A questionnaire should be pilot tested before being used in a study so that the researcher obtains criticisms and recommendations from the respondents (Gall, Gall, and Borg 2007, 336). The questionnaire was pilot tested on Africa International University campus using five (5) international students from five different countries. The pilot test showed that the test items were clear enough because the respondents were able to answer all of the questions satisfactorily.
Data Analysis Method

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 22.0) was used to analyze the data. Pearson’s Correlation test was done to determine statistical significance between variables of the hypotheses. Any “P” value that is less than or equal to 0.05 was enough to reject the null hypothesis, and any “P” value greater than 0.05 was enough to accept the null hypothesis.

A hypothesis was not generated for research question one which states: What are the major or primary causes of culture shock for international students at Africa International University? Participants’ responses of Item 7 of the questionnaire will be used to address this question. See Appendix A for the questionnaire. Any information provided was reported as descriptive findings. Findings were displayed through percentages and frequency tables.

There was no hypothesis posited for research question two which states: What are the major or primary effects of culture shock for international students at Africa International University? Participants’ responses of Item 8 of the questionnaire were used to address this question. See Appendix A for the questionnaire. Any information provided was reported as descriptive findings. Findings were displayed through percentages and frequency tables.

In response to research question three which states: How demographic factors (specifically gender, age, and country of origin) affect the experience of culture shock? Three hypotheses were generated and were tested:

$H_01$: There is no significant relationship between gender and the experience of culture shock.

The data that was used to test this hypothesis was taken from item 2 and item 6 of the questionnaire. See Appendix A for the questionnaire. A correlation test was
done to determine if there exists a significant relationship between the variables gender and the experience of culture shock. The level of statistical significance was analyzed to determine whether gender affects the experience of culture shock.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between age and the experience of culture shock.

To test this hypothesis, data collected from item 3 and item 6 of the questionnaire was analyzed using the correlation test to determine whether the null hypothesis should be rejected or fail to be rejected.

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between country of origin and the experience of culture shock.

In order to test this hypothesis, data collected from item 1 and item 6 of the questionnaire was tested using the correlation test to determine if there exists a significant relationship between the variables country of origin and the experience of culture shock. The level of statistical significance was analyzed to determine whether the experiences of culture shock vary with international students from various countries.

In response to research question four which states: How does culture shock affect international students’ academic performance at AIU? One hypothesis was formulated and was tested:

H₀₄: Students’ experience of culture shock does not significantly affect their academic performance.

To test this hypothesis, data collected from item 5 and item 6 of the questionnaire was tested using the correlation test to determine statistical significance. The level of statistical significance was used to determine whether the null hypothesis should be rejected or fail to be rejected.
In response to research question five which states: How does culture shock affect student-teacher relationships? One hypothesis was formulated and was tested: $H_0$: Students’ experience of culture shock does not significantly affect student-teacher relationships

To test this hypothesis, data collected from item 6 and item 9 of the questionnaire was tested using the correlation test. The level of statistical significance was used to determine whether the null hypothesis should be rejected or fail to be rejected.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance. This chapter discusses how the data were gathered and analyzed with interpretation of findings. Reports of the data returned were discussed in the first part of this chapter. Later in the chapter, the findings reported the tests against the hypotheses proposed in chapters one and three. Finally, the chapter discussed and interpreted the findings.

Return of Questionnaire

There was a 100% return of the questionnaires. Hundred (100) questionnaires were distributed to participants. All of the questionnaires were returned showing a 100% return rate. The table below shows the return of questionnaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 Questionnaires Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uganda  |  8  |  8  |  100%  
Liberia  |  7  |  7  |  100%  
United States of America  |  5  |  5  |  100%  
**TOTAL**  |  **100**  |  **100**  |  **100%**  

Causes of Culture Shock for International Students at Africa International University

The first research question was an inquiry to find out the major or primary causes of culture shock for international students at Africa International University.

RQ1: What are the major or primary causes of culture shock for international students at Africa International University? There was no hypothesis generated for this question. Part B Item 7 (See Appendix A) of the questionnaire was geared towards answering this question. Students were asked to rate to what degree (Not at all [1], slightly [2], moderately [3], and heavily [4]) the nine listed elements were causes of their culture shock at Africa International University. The frequency tables below displayed only those elements that were identified as major or primary causes of culture shock for international students.

**Table 4 Language Barrier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result from the frequency table shows that 51% participants identified language barrier as a major cause of their culture shock at Africa International University. Thirty percent (30%) identify it as a moderate cause of their culture shock. Fourteen – percent (14%) of respondents reported language barrier to be a slight cause of their culture shock while five percent (5%) did not identify language as a major cause of their culture shock.

**Table 5 Host Students' Attitude towards International Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 52 participants or 52% of respondents identified host students’ attitude towards international students as the primary cause of culture shock for them as displayed by the frequency table above.

Twenty six percent (26%) considered it as a moderate cause. Nineteen percent (19%) saw it as a slight cause while three percent (3%) said it is not a cause of their culture shock.

**Table 6 AIU's Educational System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the participants 61% recognized AIU’s educational system as a major or primary cause of their culture shock at Africa International University. Twenty percent (20%) said it is a moderate cause. Eleven percent (11%) considered it as a slight cause while eight percent (8%) said it was not a cause at all of their culture shock.

Table 7 Food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-two percent (52%) of the participants identified food to be a primary or major cause of their culture shock. Thirty-nine percent (39%) considered it to be a moderate cause of their culture shock. Eight percent (8%) saw it as a slight cause of their culture shock while one percent (1%) reported that it was not a cause of his/her culture shock.

Table 8 Kenya Immigration Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 52% or 52 persons identified Kenya Immigration Policies as a major or primary cause of their culture shock. Again, this is a majority of the participants.
Thirty-eight percent (38%) considered it as a moderate cause of their culture shock. Nine percent (9%) perceived Kenyan Immigration Policies as a slight cause of their culture shock whereas one percent (1%) never considered it as a cause of their culture shock.

Table 9 Too Much Course Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty-four percent (64%) of the respondents considered “too much course work” to be a primary cause of their culture shock. Sixteen percent (16%) recognized it as a moderate cause of their culture shock. Fourteen percent (14%) identified “too much course work” as a slight cause of their culture shock while six percent (6%) saw it as not being the cause at all of their culture shock.

Summary of Causes of Culture Shock

There were six (6) major or primary causes of culture shock identified by the participants in this study. They are the language barrier, Kenyans’ attitudes toward international students, AIU’s educational system, food, Kenyan immigration policies, and too much course work.

The researcher identified the participants’ major or primary causes of their culture shock by recognizing the percentages or frequencies of participants identifying a construct as a major cause of their culture shock. The higher the percentage or frequency of participants identifying a construct as a major cause of their culture
shock the more likely that construct can be recognized as a major cause of culture shock.

Effects of Culture Shock for International Students at Africa International University

The second research question was an inquiry to find out the major or primary effects of culture shock for international students at Africa International University.

RQ2: What are the major or primary effects of culture shock for international students at Africa International University?

There was no hypothesis generated for this question. Part B Item 8 (See Appendix A) of the questionnaire was geared towards answering this question. Participants were asked to rate to what degree (Not at all [1], slightly [2], moderately [3], and heavily [4]) the nine listed constructs were effects of their culture shock at Africa International University. The frequency tables below displayed only constructs that have been identified as major or primary effects of the experience of culture shock.

### Table 9 Homesickness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above frequency table shows that 57% of respondents identified “Homesickness” to be a major effect of their experience of culture shock. Twenty-percent (20%) considered it as a moderate effect of their experience of culture shock. Thirteen percent (13%) saw it as a minor or slight effect of their experience of culture shock.
shock while ten percent (10%) never saw it as an effect of their experience of culture shock.

**Table 10 Social Withdrawal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-two percent (52%) of the participants identified “social withdrawal” as a major or primary effect of their experience of culture shock. Twenty-one percent (21%) considered it a moderate effect of their experience of culture shock. Eighteen percent (18%) of respondents identified social withdrawal as a slight or minor effect while nine percent (9%) of respondents never recognized it as an effect.

**Table 11 Inability to Cope with the Language of Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The inability to cope with the language of instruction” was considered to be a major effect of the experience of culture shock by 53% of participants. It was a moderate effect for 24% of participants. Twenty percent (20%) of the participants saw it as a slight effect of their culture shock whereas 3% reported that it was not at all an effect of their culture shock.
Table 12 Difficulty in Adapting to the Teaching Methods at AIU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-one percent (51%) of participants considered “difficulty in adapting to the teaching methods at AIU” to be a major effect of their experience of culture shock.

It was considered to be a moderate effect for 30% of the participants. Thirteen percent (13%) of participants identified “difficulty in adapting to the teaching methods at AIU” as a slight effect of their experience of culture shock while 6% of participants never considered it at all as an effect.

Table 13 Challenges in Adjusting to Rigorous Library Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-two percent (52%) of the participants identified “challenges in adjusting to rigorous library research” as a major effect of their experiences of culture shock.

Thirty percent (30%) of participants considered it a moderate effect. Twelve percent (12%) recognized “challenges in adjusting to rigorous library research” as a slight effect of their experiences of culture shock while 6% perceived it as not at all an effect of their experiences of culture shock.
Summary of the Effects of Culture Shock

There were five (5) major or primary effects of culture shock identified by the participants of this study. They are homesickness, social withdrawal, inability to cope with the language of instruction, difficulty in adapting to the teaching methods at AIU, and challenges in adjusting to rigorous library research. The higher the percentage or frequency the more likely a construct was considered as a major effect of the experiences of culture shock for participants.

Demographic Factors and the Experience of Culture Shock

The third research question was geared towards finding out whether demographic factors such as gender, age, and country of origin affect the experience of culture shock. It states,

**RQ3:** How do demographic factors (specifically gender, age, and country of origin) affect the experience of culture shock?

To this effect, there were three hypotheses formulated.

**H₀₁:** There is no significant relationship between gender and the experience of culture shock.

In order to test the hypothesis, items 2 and 6 in the questionnaire in Appendix A were generated. The responses of participants were cross tabulated and analyzed using correlational analysis. Below are the results.

**Table 14 Experience of Culture Shock and Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of Culture Shock</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table of cross tabulation, it can be observed that 84.4% of males had low experiences of culture shock. The males with very high experiences of culture shock were 4.4%. Females with very high experiences of culture shock were 73%. The females with low experiences of culture shock were 3.6%.

Looking at the percentages from the table, the researcher concluded that the females experienced high and very high level of culture shock while males experience low levels of culture shock.

The table below presents the correlational analysis of participants’ responses. It is followed by a brief explanation of the results.

**Table 15 Correlation between Experience of culture Shock and Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Experience of Culture Shock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience of Culture Shock</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.203*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=100  confidence level = 0.05  p = 0.030  r = 0.203  reject H0 if p ≤ 0.05

The correlation coefficient of 0.203* seen in the correlations table above reveals a positive correlation between gender and the experience of culture shock. The statistical significance is 0.030 which is less than the alpha value of 0.05 needed to
reject the null hypothesis. Any statistical significance that is less than or equal to 0.05 is enough to reject the null hypothesis.

Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. The results showed that there exists a relationship between gender and the experience of culture shock. The table of cross tabulation above explained this relationship. Females tended to experience high and very high levels of culture shock compare to males who on the contrary experienced lower levels of culture shock.

The second hypothesis posited in this study to help answer RQ3 stated:

**H02:** There is no significant relationship between age and the experience of culture shock

In order to test the hypothesis, items 3 and 6 in the questionnaire in Appendix A were generated. The responses of participants were cross tabulated and analyzed using correlational analysis. Below are the results.

**Table 17 Experience of Culture Shock and Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of Culture Shock</th>
<th>18-23</th>
<th>24-29</th>
<th>30-35</th>
<th>36-41</th>
<th>42 and above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1(3.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.58%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>5(31.3%)</td>
<td>8(80%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6 (19.4%)</td>
<td>6(21.4%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>6(37.5%)</td>
<td>2(20%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11(35.5%)</td>
<td>15(53.6%)</td>
<td>3(13.3%)</td>
<td>2(12.5%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>13(41.9%)</td>
<td>6 (21.4%)</td>
<td>1(6.7%)</td>
<td>3(18.6%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cross tabulation table showed that 77.4% of participants of the age range 18-23 had high to very high experiences of culture shock while 75% of participants of the age range 24-29 had high to very high experiences of culture shock. Participants
of the age range 30-35 who had high to very high experiences of culture shock were 20%. Participants of age range 36-41 who had high to very high experience of culture shock were 31.1%. No participant of the age range 42 and above experienced high to very high levels of culture shock. Participants of the age range 18-23 who had moderate to low experiences of culture shock were 22.6%. Participants of age range 24-29 who had moderate to low experiences of culture shock were 25%. Participants of age range 30-35 who had moderate to low experiences of culture shock were 80%. Participants of age range 36-41 who had moderate to low experiences of culture shock were 68.8%. Finally, participants of age range 42 and above who had moderate to low experiences of culture shock were 100%.

Based on the results from the table, the researcher concluded that the younger international students of age range 18-23 and 24-29 experienced high to very high degree of culture shock whereas older international students of age range 30-35, 36-41, and 42 and above experienced moderate to low degree of culture shock.

Below is the correlational analysis of the variables experience of culture shock and age. It is followed by a brief explanation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18 Correlation between Experience of Culture Shock and Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Culture Shock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Culture Shock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=100  Confidence level = 0.05  p = 0.031  r = 0.216  reject H₀ if p ≤ 0.05

After the correlational analysis was done, the correlation coefficient 0.216 shows a positive correlation between the variables of age and the experience of culture shock as seen in the table above. In addition, the level of statistical
significance is 0.031 which is less than the alpha value of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The results show that there exists a relationship between age and the experience of culture shock. The younger international students had high to very high experiences of culture shock while their older counterparts had moderate to low experiences of culture shock.

The third hypothesis formulated to help answer research question three stated:

**H₀₃:** There is no significant relationship between country of origin and the experience of culture shock.

In order to test the hypothesis, items 1 and 6 in the questionnaire in Appendix A were generated. The responses of participants were cross tabulated and analyzed using correlational analysis. Below are the results.

**Table 19 Experience of Culture Shock and Country of Origin Cross Tabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of Culture Shock</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
<th>South Sudan</th>
<th>Democratic Republic of Congo</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
<th>Liberia</th>
<th>United States of America</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>1(6.7%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1(5%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>1(6.7%)</td>
<td>4(26.6%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4(50%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8(40%)</td>
<td>10(50%)</td>
<td>7(46.6%)</td>
<td>4(26.6%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>1(12.5%)</td>
<td>1(14.3%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>11(55%)</td>
<td>10(50%)</td>
<td>17(46.6%)</td>
<td>6(40%)</td>
<td>10(100%)</td>
<td>3(37.5%)</td>
<td>6(85.7%)</td>
<td>5(100%)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cross tabulation table showed that 100% of students from the United States of America had very high experiences of culture shock. One hundred percent (100%) of Ethiopian students also had very high experiences of culture shock. Liberian students who rated their experiences of culture shock as very high were at 85.7%. Nigerian students with a very high rating of experiences of culture shock
followed with 55%. South Sudan students were at 50% while Ugandan students with very high experiences of culture shock and were at 37.5%. Students from the Democratic Republic of Congo and Tanzania with very high rating of their experiences of culture shock came in with 46.6% and 40% respectively.

Fifty percent (50%) of South Sudanese students had high experiences of culture shock. Students from the Democratic Republic of Congo with high experiences of culture shock were at 46.6%. Nigerian students with high experiences of culture were at 40%. Students from Tanzania with high experiences of culture shock were at 26.6%. Students from Liberia who had high experiences of culture shock were at 14.3%. Students from Uganda with high experiences of culture shock were rated at 12.5%. No students from Ethiopia and the United States of America had a high experience of culture shock.

Students from Uganda who had moderate experiences of culture shock were rated at 50%. Students from Tanzania with moderate experiences of culture shock were rated at 26.6%. Students from the Democratic Republic of Congo with moderate experiences of culture shock were at 6.7% and five percent (5%) of students from Nigeria had moderate experiences of culture shock. No students from South Sudan, Ethiopia, Liberia, and the United States of America had a moderate experience of culture shock.

Students from Tanzania with low experiences of culture shock were rated at 6.7%. The other countries never had a student who reported low experience of culture shock. From the results given by the cross tabulation of the variables country of origin and the experience of culture shock, the researcher concluded that the variable country of origin affects the experience of culture shock as is evident with students
from the USA, Ethiopia, Liberia, and Nigeria who had the highest percentages of students who experience very high level of culture shock compared to those from the rest of the countries.

The table below presents the correlational analysis of the participants’ responses. The results will be briefly discussed.

**Table 20 Correlation between Experience of Culture Shock and Country of Origin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Experience of Culture Shock</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=100  Confidence level = 0.05  p = 0.038  r = 0.117  reject H0 if p ≤ 0.05

From the correlations table above, we observe that there is a positive correlation (0.117) between the variables country of origin and the experience of culture shock. The statistical significance value of 0.038 as shown in the analysis is less than the alpha value of 0.05.

Therefore, this study rejects the stated null hypothesis three (3) of this research. There exists a relationship between the variables country of origin and the experience of culture shock. Thus, students from the USA, Ethiopia, Liberia, and Nigeria have the likelihood of experiencing very high level of culture shock at Africa International University.

The Experience of Culture Shock and Academic Performance
The fourth research question was geared towards finding out whether the experience of culture shock affects international students’ academic performance. It stated:

**RQ4:** How does culture shock affect international students’ academic performance at AIU? To this effect, one hypothesis was formulated.

**H₀₄:** Students’ experience of culture shock does not significantly affect their academic performance

In order to test this hypothesis, items 5 and 6 in the questionnaire in Appendix A were generated. The responses of participants were cross tabulated and analyzed using correlational analysis. Below are the results.

**Table 21 Academic Performance and the Experience of Culture Shock Cross Tabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance (GPA)</th>
<th>Experience of Culture Shock</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0-2.5</td>
<td>1(6.25%)</td>
<td>1(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-3.0</td>
<td>1(6.25%)</td>
<td>5(87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.5</td>
<td>1(6.25%)</td>
<td>1(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5-4.0</td>
<td>13(81.3%)</td>
<td>1(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, we observed that 81.3% of students with low experiences of culture shock had the GPA range of 3.5-4.0. Students with moderate experiences of culture shock with the GPA range of 2.5-3.0 were 87.5%. Students with high experiences of culture shock with the GPA range of 2.0-2.5 were 93.5%. Finally, 89% of students with very high experiences of culture shock had GPA the range of 2.0-2.5. By observing the percentages of respondents, the researcher concluded that students with low experiences of culture shock had high GPAs while
those with high to very high experiences of culture shock had low GPAs. The lower
the experience of culture shock the higher the academic performance and the higher
the experience of culture shock the lower the academic performance. Below is the
correlational analysis of the variables experience of culture shock and academic
performance. The correlational analysis is followed by a brief explanation.

Table 22 Correlation between Academic Performance and Experience of
Culture Shock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Performance</th>
<th>Experience of Culture Shock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.265**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Culture</td>
<td>-0.265**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=100  confidence level = 0.05  p = 0.004  r = -0.265**  reject H0 if p ≤ 0.05

The correlation analysis shows a correlation coefficient of -0.265** which
means there exists a negative correlation between the variables experience of culture
shock and academic performance. The lower the culture shock experience, the higher
the academic performance and the higher the culture shock experience the lower the
academic performance. Furthermore, the statistical significance value of 0.004 is less
than the alpha value of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. There exists
a relationship between the variables experience of culture shock and academic
performance.

The Experience of Culture Shock and Student-Teacher Relationships

The fifth research question was geared towards finding out whether then
experience of culture shock affects student-teacher relationships. It stated: RQ5:
How does culture shock affect student-teacher relationships? To this effect, one hypothesis was posited.

**H05**: Students’ experience of culture shock does not significantly affect student-teacher relationships out of the classroom.

In order to test this hypothesis, items 6 and 9 in the questionnaire in Appendix A were generated. The responses of participants were cross tabulated and a correlational analysis performed. Below are the results.

**Table 16 International Students' Interaction with Teachers out of Classroom and the Experience of Culture Shock Cross Tabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Students’ Interactions with teachers out of Classroom</th>
<th>Experience of Culture shock</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>6(27%)</td>
<td>1(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>5(62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4(18%)</td>
<td>1(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>12(55%)</td>
<td>1(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table of cross tabulation showed that 55% of international students with low experiences of culture shock always interacted with teachers out of the classroom while 27% with low experiences of culture shock had never interacted at all with teachers out of the classroom. Eighteen percent (18%) of respondents often interact with teachers out of the classroom. Students who had moderate experiences of culture shock and rarely interact with teachers out of the classroom were 62.5%. Students with high experiences of culture shock who never interacted with teachers out of the
classroom were 72% while students with very high experiences of culture shock who never interact with teachers out of the classroom were 93.3%.

Interpreting the results from the table, the researcher concluded that international students with low experiences of culture shock often and always interacted with teachers out of the classroom while those with high and very high experiences of culture shock never or rarely interacted with teachers out of the classroom.

Table 24 International Students’ Interactions with Teachers out of the classroom and the Experience of Culture Shock Correlational Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences of Culture Shock</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>International Students’ interactions with teachers out of the classroom</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of Culture shock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiences of Culture shock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students’ interactions with teachers out of the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Students’ interactions with teachers out of the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=100 confidence level = 0.05 p = 0.002 r = -.301** reject H₀ if p ≤ 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation analysis shows a correlation coefficient of -.301** which means there exists a negative correlation between the variables experience of culture shock and student-teacher relationships. The variable student-teacher relationship was measured by determining the frequency of interactions between students and teachers out of the classroom. Furthermore, the statistical significance value of 0.002 is less than the alpha value of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. There exists a relationship between the variables experience of culture shock and student-teacher relationships. The higher the experiences of culture shock, the rarity or no interactions
between international students and teachers out of the classroom and the lower the experiences of culture shock, the higher the interactions between international students and teachers out of the classroom.

Discussion and Interpretation of Findings

The findings in relation to RQ1 showed that the majority of international students identified language barrier, Host students’ attitudes toward international students, AIU’s educational system, food, Kenyan immigration policies, and too much course work to be the major or primary causes of their culture shock. Every element identified as a major cause of culture shock had a percentage rating above 50%.

The findings imply that of the constructs or elements given to respondents, the above constructs were identified as the foremost causes of international students’ experiences of culture shock. Over 50% of respondents identified each of the elements as a leading cause of their experiences of culture shock. The findings can be related to the results of a study conducted by Stephen H. Miller and Sharon Green in 2008 as cited in the literature review of this research about the “Causes and Symptoms of Culture Shock” for international students at California State University. They discovered that American immigration policies, education system, food, and language barriers were leading causes of culture shock for international students. Even though their method of questionnaire distribution (by internet) was critique by this study, their results are in agreement with the findings of RQ1.

The findings in relation to RQ2 showed that majority of the international students in the study identified five (5) major or primary effects of their experiences of culture shock. They are homesickness, social withdrawal, inability to cope with the language of instruction, difficulty in adapting to the teaching methods at AIU, and
challenges in adjusting to rigorous library research. Again, every element identified as a major or primary effect of culture shock had a percentage rating above 50%.

The findings imply that of the constructs or elements given to respondents, the above constructs were identified as the foremost effects of international students’ experiences of culture shock. Over 50% of respondents identified each of the elements as a leading effect of their experiences of culture shock. The findings can be related to the results of the study conducted on international students by Andrew C. Pelling in Canada as cited in the opening chapter of this research. The research reported that Canada’s individualistic culture led to international students’ social withdrawal from activities. They could not interact with teachers because of the impersonal environment created.

Furthermore, the results of the study conducted on international students in Australia by M. Hellsten which is also cited in the opening chapter can be related to the findings of this research. The inability to adapt quickly to the problem based style of teaching and learning that is prioritized by Australian schools was a major effect of the experience of culture shock by international students in Australian schools. The inability to adapt to unfamiliar teaching methods is a major effect of the experience of culture shock as identified by the respondents of this study.

In relation to RQ3, the first hypothesis was rejected due to the fact that there was a positive correlation ($r = 0.203$) between the variables gender and the experience of culture shock. Furthermore, the statistical significance was 0.030, which is less than the alpha value of 0.05. Therefore, there exists a relationship between gender and the experience of culture shock. The table of cross tabulation showed this relationship. Seventy-three percent (73%) of females experienced high levels of culture shock
while 84.4% of males experienced low levels of culture shock. Females tend to experience high levels of culture shock while males generally experience low levels of culture shock.

Findings from the questionnaire imply that female international students experience higher levels of culture shock than their male counterparts at AIU. This is a diversion from the empirical study conducted by Miller and Green cited in the literature review. These researchers found that there was no significant difference between males and females in the degree to which respondents encountered culture shock. However, the findings from this research are supported by the research of Stedham and Yamamura (2004), whom Miller and Green cited in their research. According to these researchers, females tend to be more relationship oriented, with strong emphasis on interaction, communication, and harmony. When these expectations are not met while in a foreign culture, females tend to withdraw socially from interactions with host nationals. Such a withdrawal can lead to high levels of culture shock experiences.

The second hypothesis posited for RQ3 was rejected because the findings showed a positive correlation ($r = 0.216$) between the variables age and the experience of culture shock. The statistical significance value of 0.031 is less than 0.05, thus, there exists a relationship between international students’ age and the experience of culture shock. In the cross tabulation table, we observed that most of the students of age range 18-23 and 24-29 had high and very high experiences of culture shock whereas most students of age range 30-35, 36-41, and 42 and above had lower experiences of culture shock. Younger international students tend to have higher experiences of culture shock than older international students according to the findings of this study.
This finding accords with the research conducted by Miller and Green, as cited in the literature review. According to their research, younger international students experience higher levels of culture shock than older international students.

The younger international students identified the inability to communicate interpersonally with students from the host country as a leading cause of their high levels of culture shock. The inability to communicate interpersonally can also lead to social withdrawal which was identified by majority of the participants in this study as a major effect of their experiences of culture shock.

The third hypothesis formulated for RQ3 was rejected. This is because the statistical significance value 0.038 is lower than the alpha value of 0.05. The correlation coefficient is positive ($r = 0.117$). Therefore, there exists a positive relationship between the variables country of origin and the experience of culture shock. According to this study, international students’ countries of origin affect their experiences of culture shock. This fact can be seen clearly from the table of cross tabulation of the variables experience of culture shock and country of origin. International students from the USA, Ethiopia, Liberia, and Nigeria had very high experiences of culture shock compared to the rest of the countries.

The finding of the third hypothesis implies that the countries of origin of international students at AIU have impact on the level of culture shock experience by international students. As observed from the finding, international students from the USA, Ethiopia, Liberia, and Nigeria are more likely to experience very high levels of culture shock at Africa International University compare to international students from other countries. This finding can be related to the results of the research done by Yook (1995) about Malaysian students in an American basic speech class as cited in
the literature review. In this research, the leading cause of Malaysian students’ experiences of culture shock was language barrier. This too could apply to the findings of this research since language barrier was identified by 51% of respondents as a major cause of their experiences of culture shock for international students at AIU. International students from the above countries are not Swahili speakers; therefore communicating in the host culture language is extremely difficult. An interesting fact to note from this finding is that all the non-Swahili speakers experienced high to very high degrees of culture shock as indicated by the non-Swahili speaking countries high percentage ratings while Swahili speakers experienced less culture shock. There could be cultural similarities between Kenya and the two Swahili speaking countries, Tanzania and Uganda. Therefore, international students from these countries do not have high to very high degrees of culture shock since together with Kenya they are Swahili speaking countries who shared common borders.

In relation to RQ4, one hypothesis was formulated and tested. The hypothesis was rejected due to the findings. The findings showed that there is a negative correlation \( r = -0.269^{**} \) between the experience of culture shock and academic performance. In addition, the statistical significance value of 0.007 is far less than the alpha value of 0.05, thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. The table of cross tabulation showed that 93.5% of international students with high experiences of culture shock had the GPA range of 2.0-2.5. In addition, those with very high experiences of culture shock who had the GPA range of 2.0-2.5 were 89%. Students with low experiences of culture shock with the GPA of 3.5-4.0 were 81.3%. This leads to the conclusion that the higher the experience of culture shock, the lower the
academic performance and the lower the experience of culture shock the higher the academic performance.

The findings from the questionnaire indicate that the higher the experiences of culture shock for international students at AIU the lower their academic performance, which is indicated by their low GPAs, and the lower their experiences of culture shock the higher their academic performance, which is indicated by their high GPAs. Therefore, high experiences of culture shock correlate with poor academic performance whereas low experiences of culture shock correlate with high academic performance.

The reasons to support the finding that the higher the experiences of culture shock the lower the academic performance of international students at AIU lie in the results of RQ1 and RQ2. The findings of RQ1 shows that majority of international students at AIU recognized language barrier (51%), AIU’s educational system (61%), and too much course work (64%) to be the primary or major causes of their experiences of culture shock. These causes lead to the general effects of the experience of culture shock identified by respondents of this study in RQ2. All the effects of the experience of culture shock identified by respondents of this study may contribute to the poor academic performance of international students. They are homesickness, social withdrawal, inability to cope with the language of instruction, difficulty in adapting to the teaching methods at AIU, and challenges in adjusting to rigorous library research. Homesickness is a psychological disorientation that causes mental strain or stress for international students at AIU. Such students always long for the comfort of their home countries thus impairing their ability to think about academic matters because their minds are occupied with nostalgic thoughts. Such situation can lead to poor academic performance.
Social withdrawal also relates to poor academic performance in that international students do not interact socially, thereby disabling them from acquiring important information that could help them resolve academic issues that are crucial to positive academic performance. In addition, the inability to cope with the language of instruction can lead to poor academic performance because some international students like the ones who are from French and Arabic speaking countries may not understand English, thereby leading to the lack of understanding of lessons taught in the classroom.

Difficulty in adapting to the teaching methods at AIU can also lead to poor academic performance, since some international students may be novices to educational technologies like ODEL, internet, and PowerPoint presentations which are often employed in AIU classrooms as teaching methods. Failure to understand these teaching methods may lead to poor academic performance since some international students may not know what to do when confronted with such teaching methods. Finally, challenges in adjusting to rigorous library research can lead to poor academic performance as international students are often faced with the pressure of writing a lot of research papers that requires understanding English, browsing for relevant online materials, and the employing of relevant research skills that may totally be unfamiliar to them.

The reason provided to support the finding that low experiences of culture shock correlate with high academic performance lies in the section of the literature review that discussed the psychosocial dimension of the experience of culture shock. In that section of the literature review, Xia mentioned that self-efficacy and optimism can allow international students to overcome the stresses that are associated with the experiences of culture shock. Once the stresses are overcome, international students
can now improve their academic performance. This is what may have happened to the international students who had low experiences of culture shock but had high academic performance at AIU.

In relation to RQ5, one hypothesis was formulated and tested. The hypothesis was rejected due to findings. The findings showed that there exists a negative correlation \( r = -0.301^{**} \) between the variables “experience of culture shock” and “student-teacher relationships”. Moreover, the statistical significance value of 0.002 is far less than the alpha value of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

There exists a relationship between the experience of culture shock and student-teacher relationships. In order to measure the variable student-teacher relationships, the researcher used a rating scale to determine how often international students interact with lecturers or teachers out of the classroom. The table of cross tabulation showed this relationship. International students who had high experiences of culture shock but never interacted at all with teachers out of the classroom were 72% while those with very high experiences of culture shock who never interacted with teachers out of the classroom were 93.3%. Fifty-five percent (55%) of those with low experiences of culture shock always interacted with teachers out of the classroom.

The findings of hypothesis five under RQ5 indicate that international students who had high to very high experiences of culture shock were more likely not to interact at all with teachers or professors out of the classroom at AIU and those with low experiences of culture shock interacted often and always with teachers out of the classroom at AIU. This finding is related to one of the three ways Xia proposed that are necessary to reduce the experiences of culture shock as cited in the literature review. Self-efficacy and optimism are necessary in order to overcome the experiences of culture shock. The students who had high to very high experiences of
culture shock had low self-efficacy and were pessimistic, which resulted in poor students and teachers interaction out of the classroom while those with low experiences of culture shock always interacted with teachers out of the classroom. The international students with low experiences of culture shock had high level of self-efficacy and were very optimistic. This led to their ability to reduce their experiences of culture shock, thereby improving their relationship with teachers out of the classroom.

In addition to the literature review, a finding of RQ2 can assist in clarifying why high to very high experiences of culture shock is related to poor student and teacher relationships out of the classroom at AIU. Social withdrawal, one of the identified effects of the experience of culture shock as mentioned by the findings of RQ2 can be related to the poor student and teacher relationships of some international students at AIU. Social withdrawal can disable meaningful conversations between students and teachers especially international students from West Africa who have been taught culturally that social interactions with elders like the professors or lecturers are consider as taboo and are disrespectful.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study was aimed at investigating the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance at Africa International University. This chapter summarized the findings, analysis and interpretations based on the problem statement, purpose of the study, and significance of the study. In addition, the chapter provided the conclusions, implications and recommendations and areas of further research.

Research Problem

The research investigated the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance at Africa International University. Given that Africa International University has a diverse student population from various parts of the world; it is of vital importance that the unavoidable phenomenon of culture shock be investigated in relation to how it affects the academic performance of international students at Africa International University.

Research Purpose

The purpose of the research was to provide information on how the experience of culture shock affects the academic performance of international students at Africa International University. In addition, the research also recommends practical ways through which the experience of culture shock can be reduced, thus enhancing international students’ academic performance. In conducting this meticulous inquiry,
the researcher used the quantitative method to gather quantifiable information from respondents who were all international students. In an effort to investigate this matter, the following research questions guided the research:

RQ1. What are the major or primary causes of culture shock for international students at Africa International University?

RQ2. What are the major or primary effects of culture shock for international students at Africa International University?

RQ3. How do demographic factors (specifically gender, age, and country of origin) affect the experience of culture shock?

RQ4. How does the experience of culture shock affect international students’ academic performance at AIU?

RQ5. How does the experience of culture shock affect student-teacher relationships at AIU?

Significance of the Study

Academic institutions that are enrolling international students need to help these students adjust to both the host culture and the new academic environment as these have significant impact on the academic performance of international students. The recognized causes and effects of the experience of culture shock mentioned in this study should be taken into consideration and mechanisms put in place to minimize their occurrences. Information about how demographic factors such as gender, age, and country of origin affect the experience of culture shock is very important for educational administrators who are constantly designing policies to serve the diverse student body of Africa International University. In addition, it could
also help future researchers in understanding some aspects of the phenomenon called culture shock.

Information about how the experience of culture shock affects international students’ academic performance is also essential to both administrators and teachers. This information could lead to more diversification of teaching methods and academic counseling for international students. Information about how the experience of culture shock affects the relationships between teachers and international students is crucial to improving academic performance. The church could also benefit from the information provided by this research. It could help improve missional strategies that are aimed at evangelizing to international students. Finally, this study is important to our African context since students are constantly leaving one African country to study in another African country. Information provided by this research could help international students better prepare for the unavoidable experience of culture shock.

Research Design

This research design was descriptive survey and also utilized random sampling by using every second entry from each country sample frame to get a more convenient sample size. The researcher employed the random sampling method by selecting number 1 as the random start before selecting every second entry from each sample frame. A sample size of 100 international students was used in this study. The researcher used all the students in a population that had 10 or fewer students. Forty percent (40%) of the sample frames of Nigeria and South Sudan were used in the study. Fifty percent (50%) of the sample frames of the Democratic Republic of Congo and Tanzania was used in the study. A 100% return of questionnaire was achieved for
the study. Closed ended questionnaire was the survey instrument used to gather students’ responses.

The Likert Scale of Summated Ratings was used to measure the respondents’ experiences of culture shock, causes of their experiences of culture shock, effects of their experiences of culture shock, and international students’ interactions with teachers out of the classrooms. Pearson’s Correlation test was used to test the relationship between the variables in the hypotheses. In the first three hypotheses, the demographic variables of gender, age, and country of origin were treated as the independent variables while the experience of culture shock was treated as the dependent variable. In the last two hypotheses, the variables academic performance and student-teacher relationships were treated as dependent variables while the variable experience of culture shock was treated as the independent variable. The researcher was testing the relationships between the variables.

Summary of Findings

**Causes of the Experience of Culture Shock for International Students at Africa International University**

**RQ1:** What are the major or primary causes of culture shock for international students at Africa International University?

No hypothesis was postulated for this research question.

The findings revealed that majority of international students at AIU identified six (6) causes from the list of selected possible causes of culture shock to be major or primary causes of culture shock at AIU. They are language barrier, Host students’ attitudes toward international students, AIU’s educational system, food, Kenyan immigration policies, and too much course work. Fifty-one percent (51%) of
participants saw language barrier as the primary or a major cause of their culture shock. Fifty-two percent (52%) of participants identified the host students’ attitudes toward international students as a primary cause of their culture shock. Sixty-one percent (61%) of participants considered AIU’s educational system as a major cause of their culture shock. Fifty-two percent (52%) of participants considered food as a major cause of their culture shock. Fifty-two percent (52%) of participants identified Kenyan immigration policies as a major cause of their culture shock. Sixty-four percent (64%) of participants saw “too much course work” as a major cause of their culture shock.

Effects of the Experience of Culture Shock for International Students at AIU

**RQ2:** What are the major or primary effects of culture shock for international students at Africa International University?

No hypothesis was formulated for this research question.

The findings revealed that majority of international students at AIU identified five (5) effects from the list of selected possible effects of culture shock to be major or primary effects of culture shock at AIU. They are homesickness, social withdrawal, inability to cope with the language of instruction, difficulty in adapting to the teaching methods at AIU, and challenges in adjusting to vigorous library research. Fifty-seven percent (57%) of participants considered homesickness as a major or primary effect of their experiences of culture shock. Fifty-two percent (52%) of participants identified social withdrawal as a primary effect of their experiences of culture shock. Fifty-three percent (53%) of participants perceived the inability to cope with the language of instruction as a major effect of their experiences of culture shock. Fifty-one percent (51%) of participants considered not adapting to the teaching methods at AIU as a
primary or major effect of their experiences of culture shock. Finally, fifty-two percent (52%) of participants identified not adjusting to rigorous library research as a major effect of their experiences of culture shock at Africa International University.

Demographic Factors and the Experience of Culture Shock

**RQ3:** How do demographic factors (specifically gender, age, and country of origin) affect the experience of culture shock?

In order to answer this research question, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested.

**H₀₁:** There is no significant relationship between gender and the experience of culture shock.

This null hypothesis was rejected after conducting the correlation test. The test showed a statistical significant value of $p = 0.030$ which is lesser than the standard significant value of $p \leq 0.05$ which is needed to reject the hypothesis. The correlation coefficient gives a positive value of $r = 0.203$ which showed that there exists a positive correlation between the variables gender and the experience of culture shock. Furthermore, the results from the table of cross tabulation generally showed that females experienced high to very high levels of culture shock than their male counterparts who experienced moderate to low levels of culture shock. Seventy-three percent (73%) of females experienced very high degrees of culture shock as compare to 4.4% of males. The percentage of males that experience low levels of culture shock was 84.4% as compared to 3.6% of females.

**H₀₂:** There is no significant relationship between age and the experience of culture shock.
The null hypothesis was rejected after conducting the correlation test. The test results showed a statistical significance value of $p = 0.031$ which is enough to reject the null hypothesis. The correlation coefficient value of $r = 0.216$ revealed that there exists a positive correlation between the variables age and the experience of culture shock. The results from the table of cross tabulation explained that the younger international students experienced high to very high levels of culture shock while older international students experienced moderate to low levels of culture shock. This fact is indicated by the percentages. The total percentage for international students under age 30 (considered younger by the study) who experienced higher degrees of culture shock was 63.3% while the total percentage for international students of age 30 and above (considered older by the study) was 25.3%. The total percentage of younger international students from the categories of ages who experienced low degrees of culture shock was 6.78% while the older international students who experiences of culture shock was low had a total percentage of 171.3%.

**$H_{03}$**: There is no significant relationship between country of origin and the experience of culture shock.

This null hypothesis was rejected after conducting the correlation test. The test results gave a statistical significance value of $p = 0.038$ which is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis. The correlation coefficient revealed a positive value of $r = 0.117$. This means there exists a positive correlation between the variables country of origin and experience of culture shock. The table of cross tabulation showed that international students from USA, Ethiopia, Liberia, and Nigeria experienced very high levels of culture shock than students from the rest of the other countries. Each of these countries had a percentage higher than 50% and the countries that did not experience very high levels of culture shock had the percentage of 50% and below.
Therefore, the countries of origin of international students correlate with the degree to which they experience culture shock. Students from the USA, Ethiopia, Liberia, and Nigeria have the likelihood of experiencing very high levels of culture shock at Africa International University.

Observing the data from the table, one can see that international students from the Swahili speaking countries experience low levels of culture shock than those that are from non-Swahili speaking countries like the ones above. The Swahili speaking countries share the same language (Swahili) with the host’s country (Kenya). In addition, there may be some cultural similarities. This could be the reasons for their low culture shock experience.

Academic Performance and the Experience of Culture Shock

**RQ4:** How does the experience of culture shock affect international students’ academic performance at AIU?

To answer this question, one hypothesis was generated and tested.

**H₀₄:** Students’ experience of culture shock does not significantly affect their academic performance.

The null hypothesis was rejected after conducting the correlation test. The test results gave a statistical significance value of \( p = 0.004 \) which is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis. The results revealed a negative correlation value of \( r = -0.265 \). This means that there exists a negative correlation between the variables academic performance and the experience of culture shock. Therefore, poor or low academic performance correlates with high to very high experiences of culture shock while good to very good academic performance correlates with moderate to low experiences.
of culture shock. This fact can be understood from the table. The percentages of international students with high to very high degrees of culture shock were 93.5% and 89% respectively. These students had a GPA range of 2.0-2.5. The highest percentage of international students (81.3%) who had a GPA range of 3.5-4.0 had low experiences of culture shock.

Students’ and Teachers’ Relationships and the Experience of Culture Shock

RQ5: How does the experience of culture shock affect student-teacher relationships out of the classroom at AIU?

In order to answer this question, one hypothesis was generated and tested.

H₀₅: Students’ experience of culture shock does not significantly affect student-teacher relationships out of the classroom.

This null hypothesis was rejected after the correlation test was conducted. The test results gave a statistical significance value of \( p = 0.002 \) which is statistically acceptable to reject the null hypothesis. In addition, the test also revealed that a negative correlation exists between the variables the experience of culture shock and student-teacher relationships since the correlation coefficient had a negative value of \( r = -0.301 \). The findings revealed that international students who experienced very high degree or levels of culture shock (93.3%) were more likely not to interact with teachers out of the classroom thus weakening their interpersonal relationships with teachers out of the classroom while those who experienced low degree or levels of culture shock (55%) interacted often and always with teachers out of the classroom thus strengthening their interpersonal relationships with teachers out of the classroom. The correlation is negative in that high to very high experiences of culture shock
correlate with the lack of interaction between international students and teachers whereas moderate to low experiences of culture shock correlate with frequent interactions between international students and teachers.

Conclusions

The research aimed at investigating the experience of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance at Africa International University. Thus, in regard to the summary of findings gathered, the below conclusions were made:

1. Generally, language barrier, Host students’ attitudes toward international students, AIU’s educational system, food, Kenyan immigration policies, and too much course work are the leading causes of the experiences of culture shock for international students at AIU. The study showed that each of these constructs was identified by majority of the international students who took part in the study.

2. The general effects of the experience of culture shock recognized by international students at AIU are homesickness, social withdrawal, inability to cope with the language of instruction, difficulty in adapting to the teaching methods at AIU, and challenges in adjusting to rigorous library research. As noted in the findings, majority of the international students who took part in this study identified the above constructs as the effects of their experiences of culture shock at AIU.

3. Female international students at AIU tended to experience a higher degree of the effects of culture shock than their male counterparts who generally experience less effects of culture shock. The study reveals this reality as more
females rated their experiences of culture shock as high to very high while more males rated their experiences of culture shock as low.

4. Younger international students experience a higher degree or level of the effects of culture shock than older international students who generally experience low degree or level of culture shock. The study showed that younger international students under age 30 rated their experiences of culture shock at AIU as very high while older international students of age 30 and above generally rated their experiences of culture shock as low.

5. International students from the USA, Ethiopia, Liberia, and Nigeria generally experience a higher degree or level of the effects of culture shock than international students from other countries. The findings from the study showed high percentages of students from the above countries rated their experiences of culture shock as very high. The reasons may be that those countries are non-Swahili speaking countries and dissimilar in culture to the host country unlike the Swahili speaking countries mentioned in the study.

6. International students with high to very high experiences of the effects of culture shock generally have poor academic performance. The study showed that a high percentage of students who rated their experiences of culture shock as high to very high had low GPAs while those who rated their experiences of culture shock as moderate to low had high GPAs.

7. International students with high to very high experiences of culture shock have poor teacher-student relationships out of the classroom than those international students who had less experiences of culture shock. The study showed that those international students with high to very high experiences of culture shock rarely or did not interact at all with teachers out of the classroom while
those with low experiences of culture shock interacted frequently with teachers out of the classroom.

Implications and Recommendations

Based on the conclusions reached above, the following implications and recommendations have been made for possible improvement of international students’ poor academic performance caused by their experiences of culture shock at Africa International University:

1. A rigorous cultural adaptation program should be established at AIU in which international students will be trained to speak and understand Swahili, which is the host’s local language or lingua franca. This will enable them to socially interact with host nationals and stop the social withdrawal that accompanies language barrier. In addition, English should be taught to enable international students for whom English is not the general language spoken in their home countries and also not the language of instruction in schools of their home countries to cope with the language of instruction at AIU. Lastly, this cultural adaptation program should be used to teach the norms and values of the host culture in order to avoid conflict between the host nationals and the international students.

2. Since Kenya Immigration Policies was recognized as one of the major causes of culture shock for international students at AIU, this research recommends that all immigration issues about international students be settled before their arrival for study at AIU because unsettled immigration issues may affect student learning negatively thus hindering their academic performance.
3. AIU teachers and administrators should organize training seminars that will be frequently held in order to help international students cope with the ODEL or online learning platform that is regularly used as a method of curriculum content-delivery to students. This will reduce the culture shock experiences that are associated with AIU’s educational system, thus enhancing international students’ academic performance.

4. Introductory research classes should be held in order to equip newly arrived international students to adequately master the knowledge and skills needed to search for research materials in the library. This is critical to writing excellent research papers and improving academic performance.

5. Due to the fact that females, younger international students, and students from the USA, Ethiopia, Liberia, and Nigeria have high to very high experiences of culture shock, students’ counseling sessions should be held in order to cope with acculturative stresses that are associated with the very high degree of culture shock experiences. This will make international students psychologically fit to cope with their studies and build within them the sense of self-efficacy and optimism.

6. Course work should be measured according to the credit hours given as overloading can have devastating effects on the academic performance of newly arrived international students.

7. Teachers should use variety of teaching methods to suit international students’ learning styles. The usage of various teaching methods is important because teachers are unfamiliar with newly arrived international students. Since teachers may not settle on any specific teaching method, by using various teaching methods they will identify which method best fits a particular
international student. This will help improve the academic performance of international students.

8. A social media platform should be established between international students and teachers in order to encourage interactions out of the classroom. In addition, students and teachers should make themselves available for conversations after classes as this will encourage international students to be more relational to teachers and fellow students, thus providing opportunities for academic related conversations which will help in clarifying academic issues.

9. International student academic advisors with cultural knowledge and cross-cultural communication skills could be helpful for specific cultural questions about Kenya.

10. International students at AIU who have lived in Kenya for some time could be paired up with new international students to help them with living and studying in the new country. This can be done through mentoring relationships.

Areas for Further Research

The following could be areas for further research:

1. Since this research is quantitative, there is a need to conduct a qualitative study about the experiences of culture shock and its effects on international students’ academic performance. This might provide some detailed information about the phenomenon of culture shock not covered by this quantitative study.
2. There is a need to conduct research on how experiences of culture shock affect international students’ learning styles at AIU.

3. There is a need to conduct research on which teaching methods can improve international students’ academic attainment levels at AIU.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

International students’ culture shock questionnaire

This survey is conducted by the researcher (Jutonue Mulbah) of the School of Education, Arts and Social Sciences (SEAS) of the Africa International University. His goal is to research the effects of the experience of culture shock on international students’ Academic Performance at Africa International University. All the information in this questionnaire below is confidential and will be used for educational purposes only. I appreciate your cooperation and help. Thank you!

Part A: Demography

1. What is your country of origin?

__________________________________________

2. Please indicate your gender:

   __ Male __ Female

3. What is your age?

   __ 18 – 23                __ 36 - 41
   __ 24 – 29                __ 42 and above
   __ 30 – 35

Part B: Academic, effects of culture shock and interactions with lecturers and professors

4. What type of degree are you pursuing in AIU?

   __ Undergraduate degree __ Graduate Degree

5. Academic Performance. Please tick your appropriate GPA

   a. 2.0-2.5 [ ]
   b. 2.5-3.0 [ ]
   c. 3.0-3.5 [ ]
   d. 3.5-4.0 [ ]
6. Please rate your experience of culture shock below by ticking in one of the boxes.

a. Low 1 □
b. Moderate 2 □
c. High 3 □
d. Very High 4 □

7. Please indicate by ticking to what degree you consider the following elements as causes of culture shock you are experiencing at Africa International University. (Please check the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>Slightly 2</th>
<th>Moderately 3</th>
<th>Heavily 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host students’ Attitude toward International Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIU’s Educational System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyan Immigration Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Communication (body language, facial expressions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much course work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please indicate by ticking to what degree you consider the following elements as effects of culture shock you are experiencing at Africa International University. (Please check the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>Slightly 2</th>
<th>Moderately 3</th>
<th>Heavily 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homesickness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to cope with online learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to cope with the language of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in adapting to the teaching methods at AIU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to cope with the behaviors of host students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges in adjusting to rigorous library research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to cope with teachers’ behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to use the computers effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Indicate by ticking how often you interact with lecturers and professors out of the classroom.

a. Not at all 1  
b. Rarely 2  
c. Often 3  
d. Always 4  

Thank you for your time!!!

Source of questionnaire: This questionnaire was adopted from: Stephen H. Miller, and Sharon Green. 2008. “Culture Shock: Causes and Symptoms.” International Business Research 1: 26–37. It is modified to suit the purpose of this study.
APPENDIX B

Consent Form

Consent for participation in a research

(The Causes and Effects of Culture Shock on International Students’ Academic Performance at Africa International University)

[Jutonue Mulbah]

I agree to participate in a research project led by Jutonue Mulbah from the Africa International University (AIU) in Karen, Nairobi, Kenya. The purpose of this document is to specify the terms of my participation in the project.

1. I have been given sufficient information about this research project. The purpose of my participation in this project has been explained to me and is clear.

2. My participation in this project is voluntary. There is no explicit or implicit coercion whatsoever to participate.

3. Participation involves being given a questionnaire by the researcher from the Africa International University to fill with the necessary information requested.

4. I have the right not to answer any of the questions. If I feel uncomfortable in any way, I have the right to withdraw from the study.

5. I have been given the explicit guarantees that, if I wish so, the researcher will not identify me by name or function in any reports using information obtained from this survey, and that my confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure. In all cases subsequent uses of records and data will be subject to standard data use policies at the Graduate School Board of Africa International University.

6. I have been given the guarantee that this research project has been reviewed and approved by the Graduate School Board of Africa International University. For research problems or any other question regarding the research project, the Graduate School Board of Africa International University may be contacted through [www.aiu.ac.ke].

7. I have read and understood the points and statements of this form. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

8. I have been given a copy of this consent form co-signed by the researcher.

____________________________ ______________________
Participant’s Signature Date
For further information, please contact:

Email: mjutonue@gmail.com

Tel: 0732095169

Adapted from:
APPENDIX C

Permission for Instrument Usage

February 19, 2017

Jutonue Mulbah
Africa International University
P.O.Box 24686 00502 Karen Nairobi-Kenya

Dear Jutonue,

I have granted you permission to use the instrument you asked for from the research titled “Culture Shock: Causes and Symptoms.” International Business Research 1: 26–37. You do not have to pay any fee for its usage. Good luck on your research as this is most certainly an interesting topic, more so given the situation with immigration in today’s tumultuous times!

Sincerely yours,

Stephen H. Miller
College of Business & Economics, California State University, East Bay. 25800 Carlos Bee Boulevard, Hayward, CA 94542, USA Tel: 1-510-885-3321 E-mail: stephen.miller@csueastbay.edu
APPENDIX D

Letter for Data Collection from Graduate School of AIU