Conference track «Sociology of communication»

Interpersonal communication of foreign students in a Russian university: Practices and problems.

Научный руководитель – Lebedeva-Nesevria Natalia Aleksandrovna

Oladiran Khadijat Omobolanle
Student (master)
Novosibirsk State Technical University, Институт социальной реабилитации, Новосибирск, Россия
E-mail: oladirankhadijat2014@gmail.com

In recent years, Russia has witnessed the internationalization of its educational processes, with numerous training programs available for both domestic and international students. Annually, thousands of youth arrive in the Russian Federation to acquire education.

Interpersonal communication facilitates the exchange of information, knowledge, and ideas among individuals. Through meaningful dialogues, individuals can share ideas and viewpoints, acquire knowledge from one another, and expand their comprehension. In higher education institutions, interpersonal interactions transpire not just between instructors and students but also among the students themselves. In addition, persons with interpersonal learning styles learn well when they are permitted to use their human sentiments as part of the learning process [1]. Individuals who cultivate interpersonal relationships have strong skills in reading others and demonstrate a profound understanding of the underlying causes of communication issues.

Furthermore, the insufficient examination of the problems of interpersonal interaction of the subjects in the educational environment of the university is caused by a number of reasons. First, there is a steady growth of the communicative space, which affects all human life processes as it involves numerous members of society who perform different social roles and duties [2]. Success in learning is predicated on collaborative effort with fellow students based on common intellectual interests and professional aspirations. That is where students, by interacting and sharing their opinions, form a network of contacts, which adds to their personal and professional development.

The purpose of this article was to explore the practices and problems that influence the interpersonal communication of foreign students. It has been targeted to bring out the challenges of interpersonal communications between students and how they are affected by the method of communication or the Russian universities themselves at large. The target audience are 50 foreign students of Novosibirsk State Technical University (NSTU). Data was acquired from the Novosibirsk State University of Technology utilizing paper surveys and target sampling strategies for acquiring data. Data analysis was performed by efficient SPSS for the frequency and correlation analysis. The category of responders includes 72% from nations across Africa, 22% from Asia, and 6% from countries across Europe. The subject of the research is the interpersonal communication practices and problems experienced by foreign students. The object of the research are the foreign students with their interpersonal interactions within academic and social contexts. This research will investigate the methods of communication, university policies, teacher encouragement, country of origin, academic performance, health and physical space as the independent variable. The dependent variable is the quality and comfort of interpersonal communication among foreign students.

Most students (64%) frequently or occasionally communicate with classmates during academic activities. However, 20% reported rare or no communication, indicating possible hurdles such as language or cultural difficulties. Social connection outside the institution was less common, with 34% rarely or never communicating, suggesting poor social integration outside academics.

While 42% of students reported continuous communication with Russian-speaking peers, 36% participated either rarely or rarely, alluding to limitations in cross-cultural engagement. Digital platforms, including phone and video chats (80%) and personal messaging (62%), were the most favored methods of communication. In-person meetings at the institution (40%) and outside (64%) were less popular, showing a desire for flexible, technology-based interactions. While 54% of students found university policies encouraging, 18% felt they inhibited communication, with 28% expressing mixed attitudes. 70% of students indicated that teachers rather or definitely promoted communication, underscoring the need for direct encouragement from instructors.

Significant indicators included country (r = 0.393) academic performance (r = 0.442), and health (r = 0.442), demonstrating that shared features boost comfort levels. Mood (r = 0.459) and interest in communication (r = 0.418) also played an effect, particularly when paired with high communication skills. Physical space (r = 0.312) was moderately impactful, highlighting the importance of accommodating situations. It is advised that there should be cultural exchange programs and language workshops to bridge gaps among students of different ethnicities and linguistic backgrounds. Enhance digital platforms to meet students' preferences for flexible and individualized communication approaches.

Encourage extracurricular activities and informal events to create stronger contacts outside academic contexts. Conduct workshops to empower instructors with ways to increase inclusivity and interaction among various groups. Address gaps in inclusion programs by providing clear rules and adequate resources to ensure equal support for all students.

The findings underline the necessity of promoting both academic and social contacts to increase communication among foreign students. While digital communication techniques are highly preferred, eliminating barriers to in-person contacts and encouraging diversity through university rules and teacher participation are vital. By applying these ideas, institutions can create a more inclusive atmosphere that supports varied communication requirements and enhances student integration.

References

1) Gardner, H. Taking a multiple intelligences (MI) perspective. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, v. 40, e203, 2017.

2) Poliakova, A. V. The concept of interpersonal interaction in a socio-educational environment. Problems of Pedagogy, vol. 9, No. 32, pp. 25-26, 2017.