



Re-examining reciprocity in international education

Citation of the final chapter:

Liyanage, Indika, Tran, Ly Thi and Ata, Abe W 2018, Re-examining reciprocity in international education. In Ata, Abe W, Tran, Ly Thi and Liyanage, Indika (ed), *Educational reciprocity and adaptivity: international students and stakeholders*, Routledge, London, Eng., pp.3-22.

This is the **accepted manuscript** of a chapter published by Routledge in *Educational reciprocity and adaptivity* in 2018, available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315201412>

© 2018, Abe W. Ata, Ly Thi Tran and Indika Liyanage

Downloaded from DRO:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30111646>

Re-examining Reciprocity in International Education

Indika Liyanage, Ly Thi Tran & Abe W. Ata

- **Abstract**

Reciprocity is fundamental in theorization of social relations as dialogical and mutually constituted. At the core of social constructionist understandings of learning is the assumption that cultures are shared, socially-constructed realities in which ‘others’ play an essential, irreducible part. Calls for more reciprocal relationships in international education are a challenge to all concerned stakeholders. Reciprocal approaches can uncover a deeper significance of diversity rather than simply the surface level of ethnolinguistic background, and account for the value of education for different individuals and different contexts. Engaging with differences and diversity reciprocally opens possibilities for learning and transformation for participants. Crucial to reciprocal approaches in international education is the need to recognise and build on the potential capacity of international students as partners or co-constructors of transnational knowledge. In addition, meaningful and productive reciprocity demands at least implicit recognition from participants of their own perceived norms as difference and sees diversity as mutually inclusive. This chapter provides a robust critique of reciprocity and adaptivity in international education and serves as a preamble to this volume.

Keywords: International education; Reciprocity; Adaptivity; Stakeholders; Rights and international students; Policy discourses and reciprocity; International student experience

Introduction

Reciprocity is fundamental in theorization of social relations as dialogical and mutually constituted, and of human experience of social reality as constructed in relational spaces. Any claim to meaningful understanding of the experience of international students that ignores this fails the first test. At the core of dialogical social constructionist understandings of learning or acquisition of knowledge is the assumption that cultures are shared, socially-constructed realities, and thus that ‘others’ play an essential, irreducible part in socialization into an already meaningful world (Linell, 2009). Key to this assumption, however, is the recognition that the language, practices, knowledge and conceptual systems that permeate individual cognition and learning are shared only partially, that “social construction (and structures) and individual variation are co-evolutionary” (Linell, 2009, p. 79). Integral to sharing sociocultural knowledge and practices is the individual capacity to have a sense of difference in ‘others’ encountered in social interaction. Successful interaction, if only to achieve disagreement, and the possibility of situated (re)structuring of knowledge of the world necessitates individual other-orientation (Linell, 2009), which implies a reciprocity of perspectives, the attempt to perceive the world from the perspective of the ‘other’, a fundamental tenet of the global citizenship. Intersubjectivity is not just about what interactants share, but also what they do not (Wertsch, 2000) and inherent in any attempt at mutuality or reciprocity is the possibility, or perhaps an inevitability, of alterity (Bakhtin, 1979) of new meanings in the dialogical interaction of voices:

In addition to the emphasis on mutuality and reciprocity, there are strains and tensions, differences between people and traditions, boundaries between communities (and reaching across those boundaries), knowledge, norms and expectations at variance. These tensions stand in dialectical (“dialogical”) relations to each other (Linell, 2009, p. 82).

If we put aside the idea of international education as a product for consumption (reminiscent of simplistic ‘empty vessel’ monologic transmission models of learning) and return to the idea of an international education as a learning experience that ostensibly offers more than learning

within monocultural and monolingual confines, then it is, without doubt, encountering difference that prompts learning. It is difference that makes education to be international.

Bakhtin introduced the idea of the '(the other's) strange words' with this tack on dialogue, otherness introduces strangeness, in the form of oppositions, disagreements, and discrepancies between perspectives, evaluations and accounts ... tensions evoke thoughts in the self. Thoughts are never quite neutral; they involve evaluations, with cognition and emotions clashing, judging and evaluation one another. It is the disruptive influence of the other which introduces tensions. The other's "outsideness" brings in a 'surplus' of vision, knowledge and understanding other than had before or you had expected to encounter. The other may see things from points of view that have so far been strange or unfamiliar to yourself, and this forces you to reflect and try to understand, thereby possibly enriching your, and our collective, knowledge and language. (Linell, 2009, p. 83)

Without engaging in contention about strict definitions of universities, and where and when they originated, some perennial characteristics grounded in reciprocity identification of commonalities, the preparedness for encountering difference - have persisted through time in today's representation of higher education as internationally or globally oriented. For example, these include: recognition and mobility of academic staff; welcoming, indeed expecting, a student cohort that was not simply local; teaching programs that focus on what is generally agreed to be 'higher learning', and; the pursuit and sharing of knowledge through transnational scholarship and research. Movements of scholars and students in earlier periods were admittedly perhaps more regional, rather than the global flows of today. In Europe, which likes to consider itself the birthplace of the modern university, there was still in many ways a shared cultural heritage and experience that bound the seemingly disparate kingdoms and principalities of Europe together (Altbach, 2002). A lingua franca, Latin, and the remnants, or at least the memory, of the Western Roman Empire kept alive through the structures of the Catholic Church and then resuscitated in the ninth century as the shifting political entity of the Holy Roman Empire (Liyanage & Badeng, 2016). Yet evidence abounds of movement and interaction across notional cultural, linguistic, and political boundaries. The interaction of European, Arabic and Byzantine scientists, scholars, writers and artists in twelfth century Norman Sicily is well documented as an era of remarkable innovation and cultural fusion that many argue made it the most advanced country in Europe at the time, and an excellent example of intercultural reciprocity. Institutions of higher learning flourished in the Arabic world and, during the European medieval era, Arabic translations of classic works from across Eurasia were made for the use of scholars, enabling the later return of Latin translations of lost texts to fledgling European universities. Today's internationalized higher education is of a different order because of its scale, ease of movement, much more widespread demand for higher education in a knowledge economy (Stiglitz, 2006), commodification and commercialization of knowledge as assets and services (Altbach, 2002) owned by nation states, and disparate knowledges and cultural/academic practices that are in contact. The difference is also exacerbated also by nation states' migration policies, human capacity development, public diplomacy, promotion of ICT in education, and establishment of offshore online international education (Tran & Gomes, 2017).

Calls for Reciprocity

Calls for more reciprocal relationships in international education are in fact a challenge to stakeholders - institutions, policy-makers, academic and professional staff, and students - to resolve paradoxes, evident to even the most casual observer, in theory and practice of international education. It is considered to be the high status and reputation of the education systems of BANA countries (Britain, Australasia & North America) and others that attracts

students. The very fact of the difference of Western education, and that this difference is imagined to be one that is inherently better and thus more desirable, is key to the hegemonic status it enjoys (Liyanage & Walker, 2014). This is in tension with the publicly declared value the presence of international students adds to an institution for domestic students in terms of internationalised curricula, the possibilities of development of intercultural competences, and the opportunities to establish professional and academic networks appropriate for success in a globalized world.

This claim - that international students bring valuable resources to the educational exchange and contribute to an enhanced quality of the offering to domestic students, can in fact make essential contributions to delivering the 'international' in the international education experience with its objectives of productive international/intercultural relationships and global citizenship - implies a change or transformation of the product on offer. Any acknowledgement of reciprocity, that is, of the educational offering changing, especially if there are supposedly concerns about the 'quality' of the visiting students and how they need to adapt to the 'system', can be construed as a threat to the integrity of the original product (Liyanage & Gurney, Chap 12). Positioned thus, international students find themselves in a confusing and contradictory, if not explicitly commodified, situation. They become well aware very quickly that to succeed in their studies they are obliged to adapt to and adopt new practices in a climate that explicitly devalues the practices they have used to achieve the academic success necessary for acceptance as an international student (Liyanage & Gurney, Chap 12). Yet, it is usually too evident in images and materials digitally encountered on a daily basis on university home pages as providers of the 'resource' of difference, putatively useful to have on campus for some sort of (usually joyful) improved learning experiences for domestic students with whom they study.

An alternative is that both hosts and guests pursue negotiation of other-oriented reciprocal relationships, that is, international students adapt and are accommodated (rather than assimilated), host institutions (and local domestic student peers) negotiate reciprocal accommodation of difference as well actively adapting themselves to the possibility that a diversity of academic practices and conventions, languages, knowledge, etc. of visiting students is an authentic resource for learning otherwise not available (see Hoang & Tran, Chap 4). As with the outcome of any social interaction, the relationship need not be symmetrical, but mutual. Embracing the potential to transform and enrich what was originally seen as making opportunities to study at particular institutions desirable might improve the educational experiences of staff and all students, might serve to enhance rankings, reputations or brands. Equally fundamentally, critical engagement with how a performative culture (Ball, 2003), in which the reputations of universities live or die by the double-edged sword of rankings, skews and distorts the activities and priorities of teaching institutions might open up a more inclusive and educationally productive approach to thinking about what internationalization offers and how it can be evaluated. From an institutional perspective, surely the remit of organisations devoted to research and learning is to engage with other voices, be open to reciprocity and alterity, to resisting, as Diaz (Chap 11) argues, apparently incontrovertible paradigms, to putting their own assumptions and practices under the microscope in pursuit of "yet to-be-imagined, even seemingly impossible new institutional and pedagogical realities" (Diaz, Chap 11). Reciprocity needs to be recognised as making institutions stronger, more viable, and more relevant. The broader range of theoretical views and expertise needed in order to foreground reciprocity in international education have been identified in this collection that explores the reciprocal responses to and complexities involved in international students' multiple academic and social adjustments to educational settings around the world, highlight the tensions and challenges experienced by all stakeholders.

Internationalization of Education and Neo-liberal Ideology

As several of the contributors to this volume have demonstrated, when nations, such as Australia, or Japan (Hashimoto, Chap 2), or the U.K. (Lomer, Chap 3), or Singapore (Gomes, Chap 6) calculate the benefits of internationalization primarily in economic terms, and frame policy in terms of numerical targets and market share in competition with other providers of the commodity of education in a global knowledge-based economy, the promises and possibilities of reciprocity in internationalisation of education tend to become obscured. To begin, there is a fundamental contradiction, as pointed out by Lo and Ng (Chap 5) between assertions that education is the key to social and economic development of poorer nations and decisions of universities in developed wealthy nations to impose fees for international students much higher than those paid by local/domestic students. If the performance of higher education in achieving internationalisation is evaluated using performative criteria that focus on 'bottom lines' and enrolment numbers educational outcomes framed in human experiences that are much more difficult to measure on institutional or system scales are neglected or ignored. In fact, the standards that are applied across education sectors to judge the success of institutions, and of the work of professionals, are market driven managerialist notions of performance (Stanley & Stronach, 2013) and the significance afforded rankings systems and other quantitative measures, and the linking of these to public funding, distorts the focus of all of the work of education, not just internationalization elements. These measures shape and direct the priorities of educational organisations and institutions, prefigure objectives and targets, dictate budgetary decisions, and re-define what constitutes value in the work of educators. Internationalization of education and neo-liberal ideology have gone hand-in-hand, and this has meant changes to knowledge production, exchange and consumption, and for professional educators this "has had profound consequences ... particularly with regard to their relationship to knowledge, to clients, and to the organizational structures within which most of them now work" (Beck & Young, 2005, p. 183). In policy terms of the knowledge economy, education and educators become a strategic human resource, a form of knowledge capital, and "because it is discursively powerful, state-level policy is likely to be influencing institutional discourses on international students, and consequently, on institutional practices and pedagogical relationships" (Lomer, Chap 3). At the core of the practices of teaching professionals and professional knowledge production was "inner dedication ... (or) ... inwardness ... (a) particular kind of humane relationship to knowledge" (Beck & Young, 2005, pp. 183-184). The ascendance of obsession with accountability and measurement as a means of achieving educational excellence and quality has pushed the profession of teaching, historically founded upon trust and ethics, toward being a technical, instrumental task (Codd, 2005), and, as the spiralling growth in casualization of university and college teaching staff attests, commodified teaching.

Positioned as consumers in a significant export industry, international students have in turn been commodified, and discursively constructed as the source of an important revenue stream for universities, colleges and schools – "cash cows" (Baas, 2006, p. 14) - in an era in which public policy frequently seeks to curtail spending on education and shift the cost from the state to the consumer. Alongside rhetoric positioning education as a key to success and prosperity in a rapidly changing world, those nations that are the dominant providers of education in the global market are simultaneously constructing education as a private benefit, for which the consumer must bear the cost, rather than as a public good. The commodification of international students is uncomfortably evident in ambivalent and paradoxical discourses that veer from, to give some examples, construction as unwelcome and problematic deficiency to instruments of global economic development to resources for sale to the highest bidder. International students in some contexts are becoming 'wedged' by mixed messages. On the

one hand, escalations in hostility towards immigrants, reflected in policy shifts, that make it more difficult to enter places such as the UK for study or to remain following graduation (Lomer, Chap 3), and on the other by rhetoric that extols the opportunities and benefits, for the nation and for individuals, of and for education in responding to structural gaps in job markets and for the best and brightest graduates to participate in consolidating and growing the academic and research reputation of the education sector of the host country, thus (hopefully) gaining an increased market share of the commodity of international student enrolments. In Australia, for example, international students in vocational education are taught using training packages designed to assist learners develop competencies needed for the Australian labour market, but the current immigration policy has reduced opportunities for these students to secure permanent residency. This situation has created significant contradictions and tensions as the curriculum constructs international students to be 'one of us' - a member of the local labour market, but in reality, international vocational students are positioned as visitors who are temporary sojourners in the host country and are likely to leave Australia on completion of their studies (Tran, 2013; Tran & Nyland, 2013).

Policy Discourses

Policy discourses that construct an international student identity have the effect, as Lomer (Chap 3) notes, of essentializing a very diverse group and thus simultaneously of reducing the diverse characteristics, knowledges and experiences of international students. The obverse of this is that policy can, unintentionally, create circumstances that encourage reductive thinking about the complexity and diversity of host populations. Diversity and difference are a double-edged sword in the contemporary world. Encounters with difference can lead to reflection on the nature of essential characteristics that define that difference, and reification of abstract national traits or putative strengths. Engaging with difference reciprocally opens possibilities for participants, admittedly always asymmetrical, of learning and adaptation, of alterity. But meaningful and productive reciprocity demands at least implicit recognition from participants of their own perceived norms as difference, of seeing diversity as mutually inclusive, an 'insider' or participant perspective on diversity (Liyanage, Singh, & Walker, 2016). A focus on diversity can actually compound the practice of 'othering'; although it might succeed at one level in deconstructing the reduction of difference, it risks fostering in those who see themselves as 'natives' of a national community a perception that they are not participants in the dynamic interplay of diversities (Liyanage et al., 2016) typical of the societies that at present are the dominant international student destinations. If we can construct difference and diversity as something we all have in common, we have taken the first step to a mutually productive reciprocity. Tolerance of difference is not enough, implying a preference for adaptation or acculturation by the 'other' to remedy differences, yet as Gomes' (Chap 6) discussion of the Singaporean response to internationalization illustrates, tolerance is perhaps a middle road. There, consistent with Buber's idea, introduced by Tian (Chap 8), of 'monologue' essentialising, demarcating and demonizing other groups, a refusal to engage with or orientate to 'others' positions international students as a threat or visible manifestation of a negative perception of some aspect of the world (see also Hoang & Tran, Chap 4). International students are a very visible sign of globalization and the movement of people, and thus risk being targeted by groups or individuals dissatisfied with the social and economic dislocation often associated with the changing world. In some instances, these responses to international students are simply instances of existing attitudes to difference, such as the tensions between local ethnic groups in Singapore (Gomes, Chap 6) or the lower sense of belonging reported by minority group domestic students in the USA (Krishna, Chap 10). Yet the reflections of international students in Singapore recounted by Gomes (Chap 6) reinforce that it is not

necessarily solely differences of ethnicity or language that are at issue, but the *foreignness* that inevitably follows the mobility – of labour, of capital – associated with globalism and global markets. For international students in Singapore, their foreignness made them targets of real or imagined perceived hostility which took the form of racism, xenophobia or passive-aggression, of resentment aroused by competition from outsiders in the markets for student placements and employment, representations of the ills visited upon on locals as a result of globalist neo-liberal ideology. Ironically the hurt was very much a market-oriented response of locals not getting their rightful share of university places, of jobs, of housing, and so on.

In Australia, purportedly one of the most ethnically diverse nations, foreignness is also a flashpoint for groups who feel disadvantaged by government spending on refugees, by competition for rental accommodation and work, and who dislike visible difference or foreignness, and international students have been the target of hostility, most potently evident in some violent attacks on students from India (Dunn, Pelleri, & Maeder-Han, 2011; Graycar, 2010). Tensions between the perceived effects of mobility on local populations and government policy that actively encourages an influx of international students, as was also the case in Singapore for a period of time, were nakedly obvious when the attacks in Australia were condemned in terms of the economic impact of any subsequent diminution of the flow of students, and government representatives visited India with the express purpose of defending the reputation of Australia as a safe destination for study (Nyland, Forbes-Mewett, & Marginson, 2010). Although it is also understandable that, as transient residents in a host country for the purpose of consuming a service, international students are prepared to more readily overlook or suffer any perceived impingement of their rights in other areas on grounds such as civil, race, gender, social, cultural and economic equality, it is surely the responsibility of host countries to reciprocate by guaranteeing visiting students the rights enjoyed by local students and to proactively provide and protect these rights. Students in most study destinations, well aware of their status as guests subject to visa conditions that curtail or constrain participation in local political discourse (e.g., see Gomes, Chap 6), generally choose to remain silent about any experiences of racism or hostility, even in the private sphere (Gomes, Chap 6).

Furthermore, given the promises in promotion and marketing of education, failure to meet expectations of intercultural opportunities for socializing with local students or improving language skills (Tran & Nyland, Chap 7; Tian, Chap 8) is almost predictable, in at least some aspects of the experience, and the priority accorded study because of the financial commitments involved means international students are generally less engaged with non-academic activities than their local peers (Krishna, Chap 10). Nonetheless, feelings of social isolation from the host community are common (Krishna, Chap 10), and as Tran and Nyland's (Chap 7) data show, the industrial nature of some vocational courses leaves students feeling isolated, almost quarantined from social interactions with local students for the duration of their courses. Although the internationalization literature has for decades provided myriad examples of difficulties with adjustment to new academic and sociocultural settings, orientation for international students is often brief and continuing support often inadequate (Krishna, Chap 10).

The apparent failures of policies and practices at national and institutional levels to promote authentic reciprocity in academic and social relationships with host teaching staff and students have an interesting outcome. For example, exogenous reciprocity becomes the norm among international students themselves, who mix predominantly with their international peers, either co-nationals, or from the broader region, or more globally (Tian, Chap 8; Tran & Nyland, Chap 7). The opportunities to benefit from internationalization and become globally oriented appear to be embraced much more readily by the visitors than by the locals, but social aggregation of

international students can have the effect of compounding perceptions of difference, of ‘us and them’, and make it more difficult for social interaction between domestic and international students (Tian, Chap 8). Ironically, without reciprocity, internationalisation delivers to domestic students little of the ostensible benefits promoted/claimed by state and institutional policies. Development of complex multiple identities essential for productive navigation of the contemporary world, the formation of mutually beneficial networks, the emergence of borderless communities that mobility and technology make possible seem more achievable if you leave your own home and immerse yourself in a possibly unwelcoming setting but one that consequently brings together diverse groups with few options but to embrace these possibilities.

International students who have to work part time to fund their study are vulnerable to exploitation by employers who rely on part-time and casual employees (Tran & Nyland, Chap 7). Students are often not knowledgeable about local work practices, pay rates, or work conditions, and financial pressures in tandem with difficulties finding regular work lead many, at least in Australia, to accept pay rates below the minimum wages set by the government (Baas, 2006). Restrictions on the numbers of hours worked make any who overstep this mark additionally vulnerable to unscrupulous employers who can use the threats of informing authorities of visa violations:

It’s also hard to know the extent to which student visa holders are being ripped off; all we know is that time and again they recur in stories of employers ripping off their workers. They are a group ripe for exploitation — young workers are already vulnerable in workplaces, but international students often also have poor English skills, work casually, are working in a foreign culture, often without an understanding of their rights, and are vulnerable to claims they have breached their visa conditions (which limit them to 20 hours a week paid work). (Keane, 2017)

According to the Netherlands-based International Institute for Asian Studies, “not a few students [in Australia] were arrested for violating visa regulations and sent to so-called detention centres to await deportation back to India” (Baas, 2006, p. 14)

It is interesting to compare the policy initiatives in different parts of the world and to contrast the strategies employed to attract students that are canvassed by the contributing authors. Students are no longer flowing only to the still rapidly growing international education sectors in countries such as Australia, the UK, USA, Canada, or New Zealand that have historically been the destinations of international students. The directions of international student flows are increasingly reciprocal in the geographic sense as some Asian countries and many European countries attract students both from traditional sources and from the nations previously considered to be the destinations of choice for international students. Non-traditional destinations such as Hong Kong (Lo & Ng, Chap 5), Japan (Hashimoto, Chap 2), Singapore (Gomes, Chap 6), Malaysia (Shafaei et al., Chap 9), and China (Tian, Chap 8) have adopted policies to position their systems as education hubs in a region that has been a major source of the international student flow to predominantly English-speaking nations. Although most of these countries are competing to progress what are generally estimated to be neo-liberal objectives, motivated by potential economic benefits for the host nation of supply (with all the multiplied effects) rather than consumption in the education market, and by the possibilities of international prestige and influence, differing circumstances have generated some different approaches. In contrast to nations like the UK, for example, where policy does not make it easy for students to remain in the country after graduation, or even to move seamlessly from undergraduate to post graduate study (Lomer, Chap 3), less traditional destinations outside the Western axis of elite higher education - and also of the growing immigration controversies

these countries are experiencing - have relaxed regulations to encourage internships and post-study employment. Policy initiatives to attract students to aspiring education hubs has included such as increasing the proportions of students permitted in publicly funded study programs, scholarships that provide financial support of international students, and extended even to bonded scholarships to retain graduates in the destination workforce (Lo & Ng, Chap 5; Gomes, Chap 6). A different policy direction focuses on a best practice model to achieve excellence necessary to become a regional hub (Shafaei et al., Chap 9). Although the economic benefits of export of education are not discounted, the efforts to attract international students (and academic staff) of these more recent shifts to internationalisation are part of policy frameworks to develop the quality of education available to their own domestic students and to cultivate academic reputation and prestige. In contrast, policy in traditional destinations of international students relies much more heavily on existing reputation to attract enrolments, especially of high-performing candidates, from outside its borders. While student choices can be influenced by financial cost or incentive, for some these considerations are outweighed by concerns for safety and security or religious and cultural compatibility (Tian, Chap 8).

Openness to Reciprocity

The importance of more openness to reciprocity in the organisation of study programs is evident from the research presented by Lo and Ng (Chap 5), which found that many students resist the ideology of commodification and individual ownership of education as private capital in a knowledge economy, preferring to prioritise public benefits of their education above personal monetary gain. What international students hope to achieve using their qualifications following graduation is not necessarily aligned with the local professional orientations of programs in the host country. It is easy to assume that the quality and reputations of programs that have led international students to choose to study in a foreign country means not only that education is regarded as superior in the host country, but that the source countries of students would be better off if professional practices and contexts of graduate work in host countries were transplanted there. Serious critical reflection is essential to consider how study programs devised and structured for local circumstances, and often to comply with local professional standards, can prepare graduates for the contextually responsive transfer of their learning (Liyanage & Bartlett, 2008; Liyanage, Walker, & Singh, 2015; Tran, 2011). This clearly has the potential for great benefits for domestic students as well if a truly internationalized education is to be achieved. Reciprocal approaches can uncover a deeper significance of diversity at more than the surface level of ethnolinguistic background, and to account for the value of education for different individuals and different contexts. This requires more than rejection of technical or monologic classroom teaching practices that present unchallengeable information (Tian, Chap 8) in favour of pursuit of dialogic mutuality at the content level. It requires openness to the value and legitimacy of other knowledge systems and alternative epistemological assumptions. Crucial to reciprocal teaching and learning is the need to recognise and build on the potential capacity of international students as partners or co-constructors of transnational knowledge, skills and attributes in the international classroom rather than recipients of 'Western' knowledge and ways of doing (Tran, 2013a). Openness to reciprocity means a commitment to move beyond the ethnocentric frame underpinning the sentiment that international students ('the others') need to be one of 'us'. (Hoang & Tran, Chap 4). Hoang and Tran argue that assumptions like these shape how responsibility for adaptation is perceived in discourses of international education. Also adopting the view that international students have the onus of adapting to the host environment means that host institutions are responsible for assisting international students make one-way adaptation by overcoming and adjusting their 'deficiencies' to be one of 'us'.

Although Lo and Ng (Chap 5) offer political considerations as alternative to current emphases in a marketization approach to internationalization, perhaps another implication of their study is that, if education is to be commodified as a product in a global market, more significance needs to be accorded to the demand side of the transaction, the needs and aspirations of potential students rather than assuming they are attracted solely by the inherent value of existing supply of study programs shaped by and oriented to host country contexts. Indeed, some of the participants in their study took advantage of the incentive measures offered by the host country in order to access higher education but resisted the private benefit of remaining in the host country post-graduation in favour of the opportunity to contribute to development of the social and political capital of their country of origin.

The value of education as an export is accorded high status in the national economies of key providers and market hopefuls, and is the subject of state policy and expenditures, but the discursive reduction of international education to a trade cannot be allowed to obscure the human dimension as a key concern for participants (Tran & Nyland, Chap 7). Situated in the nexus of transnational, ostensibly borderless movement and nation-state regulation, reciprocity in student-host country relationships foregrounds tension between the mobility of student rights and diversity of local contexts. In practice, the education services that constitute the core business of international education are nested in a complex set of variables – customer rights, safety and security, access to quality education and adequate accommodation, employment opportunities, and migration opportunities (Tran & Nyland, Chap 7) - that contribute significantly to the quality of the international students' experiences and are contingent on a local potpourri of political will, administrative planning, infrastructure, economic activity, and public discourse on issues such as migration and diversity. It is probably not surprising that one aspect of the international student experience in which state-level policy can attempt to manage reciprocity, protection of students' rights as consumers, is another expression of market-orientation. Proactive student awareness-raising about rights as education consumers is commendable (i.e., in Australia, Tran & Nyland, Chap 7). However, conferring responsibilities for activation of consumer rights protections on a group that often perceives itself as vulnerable in a relationship in which power is invested in the host state and institutions need to be complemented by proactive mechanisms on the part of regulators and providers to encourage consumer rights claims in a non-threatening and productive atmosphere.

Rights & International Students

That international students are themselves keenly aware of their rights as consumers to a quality educational experience is understandable given that they have been promised a world-class product. Academic satisfaction (Shafaei et al., Chap 9) is essential for a positive international student experience. If the reality does not match the promise, if there is a perception of deceptive behaviour on the part of institutions or state agencies, the dissatisfaction or anger reported by contributing authors (e.g., Tran & Nyland, Chap 7; Tian, Chap 8) is a very human response. Students are usually paying a very high price to study in a host country, not only course fees but living and travel expenses as well, often at the cost of some family sacrifice, or bearing the responsibility of some form of government scholarship; this magnifies the desire to succeed – no one wants to return home a failure - and the role attributed to quality teaching and learning experiences in achieving success. Given the financial significance of international student status, it is understandable that the focus of students is, as Tran and Nyland (Chap 7) found, primarily on their rights as consumers, rather than as students, to a quality education experience with a positive outcome, and dissatisfactions with student experiences, for example, with teaching styles or access to teaching staff as reported by Pakistani students in China (Tian,

Chap 8), are expressed in terms of value for money or misleading advertising. Of course, academic success is situated amidst a range of sociocultural and psychological variables (Shafaei et al., Chap 9) that contribute to dis/satisfaction, but some of these are open to institutional management, for example, interaction with university administration and regulations is a complex field that can be needlessly frustrating for international students (Shafaei et al. Chap 9; Tian, Chap 8). However, a more reciprocal approach that does not commodify students and position them as consumers, that is perhaps more resistant to the notion of education as a private benefit (Lo & Ng, Chap 5), might be more attuned to the complex motivations of these ‘consumers’ and how these can be turned to advantage in teaching and learning.

International Students, English Language & Academic Literacies

Ethnolinguistic dimensions of reciprocity in international students’ experiences are inevitable. Internationalization of education, the ostensible integration of international and intercultural dimensions in all aspects of higher education (Knight, 1994), have essentially been conducted using English as medium of Instruction (MOI), spawned hugely profitable English language teaching and testing enterprises (Ata, Chap 13), and been accompanied by a decline - even a “crisis” (Diaz, Chap 11) - in the teaching and learning of languages other than English in Anglophone universities, hardly an example of international and intercultural reciprocity. Perhaps most striking is the tension between international education as a levelling agent grounded in shared scholarship and (re)distribution of knowledge, and the asymmetry of the relationships between education providers and seekers, potently symbolized by the sociolinguistic gatekeeping of the English language (See Diaz, Chap 11) .

In the Anglophone destinations to which most international students flow, ‘othering’ on the basis of ethnolinguistic background begins with discourses that essentialize and problematize users of language other than English. For example, categorization as a user of English as an additional language can confer an almost “pathological” (Franson, 1999, p. 60) condition that requires treatment and remediation in order to be ‘overcome’. Rather than being recognized as a cognitive asset (Liyanage & Walker, 2014b), any emerging bi/multilingualism as students develop control of the linguistic resources of English is regarded more in terms of a deficit. In BANA settings, bi/multilingual capacities of students are largely ignored in favour of, paradoxically of linguistic deficit; English is both gatekeeper and reductive benchmark for students who are anecdotally evaluated on the basis of whether their English is judged to be ‘good’ or not (although as Diaz, Chap 11) points out, assumptions/expectations of domestic students’ English proficiency are similarly monolingually oriented and reductive, and not always realized). English has become another tradeable commodity in the global education market, foundation of a complementary ‘industry, again worth billions, in which profit-oriented organisations offer courses and testing, and publishers supply a seemingly never-ending demand for course-books and materials. A significant number of international students enrol in TESOL and Applied Linguistics programs in BANA countries in order to teach English in their country of origin, that is, the requirement for English proficiency generates part of the flow of students to universities in English-speaking destinations (Liyanage & Bartlett, 2008). With teaching and testing regimes based on standard varieties of English, generic materials and course books insensitive to local contexts, and explicit and implicit promotion of Western language pedagogies through these materials and graduates of TESOL programs, this is a dimension of international education where reciprocity is sorely lacking. Dismissal of the validity of non-standard varieties of English and cultural biases in teaching and testing

materials (Ata, Chap 13) perpetuate the dominance of traditional English-speaking student destinations and asymmetries in mutuality (see Ata 2015a; Ata and Kostogriz 2015b).

The demand for English proficiency as a pre-requisite for enrolment in study programs in the traditional student destinations of the BANA axis and the accompanying discursive construction of an ‘English problem’ (Diaz, Chap 11) rather than celebration of rich linguistic and cultural diversity, is arguably at odds with alleged opportunities for development of international and intercultural experiences and outlooks, let alone development of practical skills in areas such as languages that might advance these internationalist aspirations. Nor has linguistic reciprocity has been evident in the attempts of nations outside this sphere to attract students. Opportunities for English mother-tongue students to develop bi/multilingual skills through study in other language mediums are exceptional and reliance on English-medium programs (e.g. see Tian, Chap 8; Hashimoto, Chap 3) to attract international students to non-Anglosphere destinations remains the norm. Internationalized education could become more interesting if institutions outside the BANA circle offered ‘products’ that are distinguished by difference such as language of instruction instead of even at this global level falling into the habit of adaptation by the ‘other’ to the norms of the dominant, even on their home ground, accepting the “existing hegemonic global order” Tian (Chap 8). On another level, as Tian (Chap 8) and Krishna (Chap 10) observe, linguistic differences can be an obstacle to academic and social reciprocity (promised by marketers of international education), contributing to both perceived and actual isolation and marginalization of international students in host countries, and certainly a factor in congregation of co-nationals in both social and academic contexts that constrains opportunities for reciprocal experiences in host countries. The value of English is currently unchallenged in higher education, but, given the vibrant linguistic ecologies of internationalized education institutions (Diaz, Chap 11), a reciprocal valuing of languages other than English (LOTEs) - frequently found in the linguistic repertoires of domestic students as well as visiting students – has the potential to address this division between visiting and local students. Narrowing the gap between global citizen rhetoric of graduate attributes and rates of LOTE study could further ameliorate isolation of international students and take advantage of campus linguistic diversity. In addition to valuing the diversity of languages that students bring to the classroom, a commitment to recognising and building on students’ bilingual and multilingual capabilities to search for knowledge and intellectual capitals is seen as essential to enrich the learning experiences for all.

Furthermore, as Diaz (Chap 11) so effectively argues, the language classroom is itself a setting that nurtures the skills of dialogue and of reciprocity. The non-Anglophone European Union (i.e., excluding the UK, which is poised for exit anyway) offers a fine example of multi-language teaching and learning, including English, which integrates notions of public and private benefit as well as critically-oriented citizenship of the linguistically diverse region. The first two organising principles of the Common European Framework (Council of Europe, 2011, p. 2) could provide inspiration for international education policy-makers:

- that the rich heritage of diverse languages and cultures in Europe is a valuable common resource to be protected and developed, and that a major educational effort is needed to convert that diversity from a barrier to communication into a source of mutual enrichment and understanding;
- that it is only through a better knowledge of European modern languages that it will be possible to facilitate communication and interaction among Europeans of different

mother tongues in order to promote European mobility, mutual understanding and co-operation, and overcome prejudice and discrimination.

The spread of English has gone hand in hand with pre-eminence of Western epistemologies, education systems, and academic and professional practices, and expectations that international students will, through a “tacitly assumed osmosis-like process of academic acculturation” (Zahora, Chap 14), adopt and conform to the ways teaching and learning that are done in study destinations. Expectations that students will adapt to local conventions and practices are not limited to English-speaking institutions, as the experiences of Pakistani students in a Chinese university recounted by Tian (Chap 8) illustrate. Wherever there is an international dimension to education the balance between assimilation and accommodation of students (Liyanage, Chap 12) needs to be negotiated to the benefit of all participants. Given the power relationships between institutions and students that have been canvassed in this volume, responsibility for initiation of dialogue that is sustained throughout students’ programs of study rests with institutions. Genuine dialogue grounded on other-orientation that introduces students to discursive practices (Zahora, Chap 14) rather than simply technical tool-kits of academic conventions will facilitate productive accommodation of the strengths and knowledge that students already have at their disposal as student scholars. Support for academic staff in introduction of materials and texts that expose all students to wider and more diverse range of epistemological approaches and knowledge is one avenue for exploration if international students are to be provided contexts for participation and contribution that enriches learning for all. One of the key themes emerging from this volume is that international students prioritize their learning, that if they experience supportive, other-oriented interaction and communication with teaching and administrative staff, and domestic students, that if they believe their learning is deemed important by the institution, then they will work hard to adapt to the different circumstances, and be satisfied with their educational experience.

Further Thoughts

This volume provides valuable critiques of and challenges to the status quo that should provoke the thoughtful attention of the various stakeholders to the relational nature of the international student experience. The perspectives and insights offered to the reader make it clear that a reorientation to internationalization of education as a reciprocal enterprise can enhance and enrich the experiences of individuals and groups directly involved either as students or those with whom they interact in settings around the globe. Given more widespread critiques of the neo-liberal ideology as a solution to the problem of provision and distribution of goods and services, it is timely that the various stakeholders - university administrators and international student counsellors, private enterprises, such as education agents, and government departments dealing directly and indirectly with the international education market such as departments of education, commerce and migration undertake a serious assessment of the outcomes of this approach to the provision of education. Indeed, as Diaz (Chap 11) argues compellingly, academics need to lead the way in challenging assumptions about internationalization that limit both questions we can ask and the futures we can imagine. To facilitate this, analytical frameworks of reciprocity, such as the Buber example (Chap 7 8), need to be applied to the phenomenon of international education if the sources of dissatisfaction from both perspectives are to be addressed. As the contributing authors demonstrate, any success cannot and should not be measured merely by numbers of students, dollar values, and market shares. While the potential dividends that flow from success of international education have long been extolled as significant in human terms, both tangible and intangible, including the benefits for the work of education and research itself, under the influence of neo-liberal and managerialist ideologies

it has become the practice to measure them in very short-sighted economic terms as a \$40 billion export industry, a service provided predominantly by developed, already wealthy nations. This blinkered perspective reduces the value of education to a concentration on money changing hands, to financial gains of international education providers such as universities and colleges that recruit significant numbers of international students, and of businesses that profit from facilitation of the flows of students around the globe and satisfying their essential needs such as accommodation. How long will the viability of international education continue if reciprocity in relations in international education is ignored, if, as Tian (Chap 8) observed, “students continue to sense they are being ‘objectified’, reduced to the status of being merely a source of finance, and their education, welfare and humanity are ignored.” This positions reciprocity front and centre not only in best outcomes in academic, social and welfare dimensions of international education, but also in economic considerations. Given the scale of movement of students across borders, priority needs to be directed to some form of international agreement on the rights and reciprocal obligations of international students, one that participating nations and students must agree to and abide by. This is an area that has failed to keep pace with the changing education landscape, so much so that in Australia, for example, a study found that the rights of international students demand attention in “policy areas of education, immigration, human rights, employment, housing, transport, law enforcement, social and community affairs” (Graycar, 2010, pp. 13-14). Furthermore, the challenge offered by Lo and Ng (Chap 5) to re-envision access to an international or transnational education in a global world as a human right rather than a product with a price tag captures what has too often been lost in current approaches. While education is available only to those already in possession of wealth, any promise that it is the key to social and material development, a pathway out of poverty, appears destined to remain a myth. Rather, international education as a market arguably deepens social and class divisions and operates as a gatekeeper that excludes those who could most benefit. In a global world, wealthy nation states with high quality education systems should perhaps be intervening to promote and support a reciprocity at the national level, and rather than profiting from a flow of students to their institutions (that is, moving wealth from poorer nations to their own) take more steps to develop the availability of quality education programs in the countries from which they currently draw their international student enrolments. This must surely be the next phase of internationalization and flow of students across borders, not a one-way flow, but one that facilitates opportunities for a more reciprocally international education for students regardless of country of origin. The contradiction of the present iteration of globalization of education in which, as Lo and Ng (Chap 5) point out, nations continue to seek advantage in a putatively borderless world is failing to realize the transformative potential of education in social and human terms of a genuine reciprocity, of “adopting the initiatives of enhancing the connectivity among people from around the world by internationalization as a project of nurturing humanity, world citizenship” (Ng, 2012, in Lo & Ng, Chap 5, p. XX).

The current flow of students is lubricated by language, English, but the role of language/s in international education as merely instrumental needs overturning; the idea that one particular language is both necessary and sufficient for an authentic international education needs to be rejected to engage with the proposition that an education cannot be truly international or global if it relies on one language alone. Rather, an international education embeds reciprocity through all students’, including local/domestic students, learning of additional languages in order that it not only “engages with the linguistic but also the onto-epistemological wealth that our students bring to it” (Diaz, Chap 11, p XX). As argued convincingly by Shafaei et al. (Chap 9), the satisfaction of students is closely linked to the ease with which they are able to navigate the demands of the academic, institutional and broader cultural contexts they encounter in host countries, and this contributes directly to the overall achievement of academic success. Given

that student satisfaction and academic success is a goal shared by students and host countries and institutions, and mutually beneficial to all participants, students' study choices need to be reciprocated by proactive and planned efforts to ease their navigation of the academic, psychological, and sociocultural challenges they face in host countries. This necessitates other-orientation, flexibility and openness to alterity, adaptation that will be reciprocated in what Shafaei et al. (Chap 9) term 'positive word-of-mouth', that is, much-valued reputation and prestige as study destinations, and in experiences for both visitors and hosts that resemble more closely the promises of internationalisation.

References

- Altbach, P. (2002). Knowledge and education as international commodities. *International Higher Education*(28), 2-5.
- Ata, A. W. (2018). An investigation into the Knowledge, Education and Attitudes of Male and Female international students in Australia to the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Ata, A W (2015a) Knowledge, Education, and Attitudes of Chinese, Arab (Gulf Region) and Other Candidates to IELTS: A Case of Australia, in *Journal of International Students* vol 5 Issue 4 pp 488-500.
- Ata, A.W. and Kostogriz, A.(2015b) *International education and cultural-linguistic experiences of international students in Australia*. Brisbane: Australian Academic Press.
- Baas, M. (2006). Cash cows. Milking Indian students in Australia. *IIAS Newsletter*, 42(14), 14.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1979). *Estetika slovesnogo tvorchesta (The aesthetics of verbal creation)*. Moscow: S G Bocharov.
- Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215-228. doi:10.1080/0268093022000043065
- Beck, J., & Young, M. F. D. (2005). The assault on the professions and the restructuring of academic and professional identities: A Bernsteinian analysis. *British journal of sociology of education*, 26(2), 183-197. doi:10.1080/0142569042000294165
- Bista, K. (2018). Do Academic and Social Experiences Predict Sense of Belonging? Comparison among American and International Undergraduate Students. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Codd, J. (2005). Teachers as 'managed professionals' in the global education industry: The New Zealand experience. *Educational Review*, 57(2), 193-206.
- Council of Europe. (2011). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Retrieved from https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf
- Díaz, A. (2018). Stretching the global imaginaries of internationalisation: The critical role of intercultural language learning pedagogies. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Dunn, K., Pelleri, D., & Maeder-Han, K. (2011). Attacks on Indian students: The commerce of denial in Australia. *Race & Class*, 52(4), 71-88. doi:10.1177/0306396810396603

- Franson, C. (1999). Mainstreaming learners of English as an additional language: The class teacher's perspective. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 12(1), 59-71. doi:10.1080/07908319908666569
- Gomes, C. (2018). Navigating through the hostility: International students in Singapore. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Graycar, A. (2010). *Racism and the tertiary student experience in Australia*. Canberra: Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia.
- Hashimoto, K. (2018). Japan's "Super Global Universities" scheme: why does the number of "foreign" students matter?. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Hoang, T. & Tran, L. T. (2018). Understanding international students' adaptation motivation and behaviours: transformative, strategic, or conservative?. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Keane, B. (2017, April 11). International students need greater protection from being underpaid. *Crikey Insider*. Retrieved from http://lnk.edition.crikey.com.au/1/Ah8NjI0VUYYPBL348oSwtaki?utm_source=TractionNext&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=Insider-Subscribe-110417
- Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints. Research Monograph No. 7*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Linell, P. (2009). *Rethinking language, mind, and world dialogically: Interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Liyanage, I. & Gurney, L. (2018). International students and academic conventions: Reconciliation of disparate expectations. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Liyanage, I., & Badeng, N. (2016). Internationalisation of Australia-China higher Education in times of Globalisation. In I. Liyanage & N. Badeng (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary research perspectives in education: Shared experiences from Australia & China* (pp. 1-6). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Liyanage, I., & Bartlett, B. J. (2008). Contextually responsive transfer: Perceptions of NNES on an ESL/EFL teacher training programme. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(7), 1827-1836. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2008.02.009
- Liyanage, I., Singh, P., & Walker, T. (2016). Ethnolinguistic diversity within Australian schools: Call for a participant perspective in teacher learning. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 11(3), 211-224. doi:10.1080/22040552.2016.1272529
- Liyanage, I., & Walker, T. (2014a). English for Academic Purposes: a Trojan horse bearing the advance forces of linguistic domination? In P. W. Orelus (Ed.), *Affirming language diversity in schools and society: Beyond linguistic apartheid* (pp. 165-175). New York: Routledge.
- Liyanage, I., & Walker, T. (2014b). Accommodating Asian EAP practices within postgraduate teacher education: Perspectives from Australia. In I. Liyanage & T. Walker (Eds.), *EAP in Asia: Negotiating appropriate practices in a global context*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Liyanage, I., Walker, T., & Singh, P. (2015). TESOL professional standards in the "Asian century": Dilemmas facing Australian TESOL teacher education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 35(4), 485-497. doi:10.1080/02188791.2013.876388

- Lo, W. Y. W. & Ng, F. S. K (2018). Rethinking the Value of International Student Mobility: A Case Study of the Experience of Myanmar University Students in Hong Kong. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Lomer, S. (2018). Adaptation for national competitive advantage: policy on international students in the UK. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Nyland, C., Forbes-Mewett, H., & Marginson, S. (2010). The international student safety debate: Moving beyond denial. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(1), 89-101. doi:10.1080/07294360903277364
- Shafaei, A. (2018). Sustaining Benefits of Higher Education Internationalization through Cross-Cultural Adaptation: Insights from International Students in Malaysia. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Stanley, G. E., & Stronach, I. (2013). Raising and doubling 'standards' in professional discourse: A critical bid. *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(3), 291-305. doi:10.1080/02680939.2012.715355
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2006). *Making globalization work*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Tian, M., Lowe, J. & Lu, G. Language Learning, Intercultural Experiences and Identity (Re-)construction: Case Studies of International Students in China. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Tran, L. T. & Nyland, C. (2018). Rethinking the issue of rights for international students. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.
- Tran, L. T. & Gomes, C. (2017). Student mobility, connectedness and identity. In L. T. Tran & C. Gomes (2017). (Eds), *International student connectedness and identity* (pp.1-11). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Tran, L. T. & Nyland, C. (2013). Competency-based training, global skills mobility and the teaching of international students in VET. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 65(1), 143-157.
- Tran, L. T. (2013). Teaching international students in vocational education and training: New pedagogical approaches. Camberwell: ACER Press.
- Tran, L. T. (2013a). Internationalisation of vocational education and training: An adapting curve for teachers and learners. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(4), 492-507.
- Tran, L. T. (2011). Committed, face-value, hybrid or mutual adaptation? The experiences of international students in higher education. *Educational Review*, 63(1), 79-94.
- Wertsch, J. V. (2000). Intersubjectivity and alterity in human communication. In N. Budwig, I. Č. Užgiris, & J. V. Wertsch (Eds.), *Communication: An arena of development* (pp. 17-31). Stamford, CN: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Zahora, T. & Yazbeck, B. (2018). "Is Plagiarism still a big deal?" Disciplining international students in the discourse of plagiarism. In A. W. Ata, L. T. Tran, & I., Liyanage, (2018). (Eds). Educational reciprocity and adaptability: International students and stakeholders. New York: Routledge.