

# **Decolonising Academic Integrity**

*A critical literature review of Global South international postgraduate students' experiences at UK universities*

*(16,494 words)*

*Laura Martin-Simpson*

**ECED7010**

*Submission Date: 14th October 2025*

*Yr Athrofa: Education and Humanities*

## DECLARATION FORM



### Master's Degrees Dissertation

#### Declaration Form.

1. This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.
2. This dissertation is being submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of: **MA Equity and Diversity in Society**
3. This dissertation is the result of my own independent work/investigation, except where otherwise stated. A reference list is appended.
4. Please Choose one of the following statements
  - b. I acknowledge the use of M365 Copilot (<https://m365.cloud.microsoft/chat/?auth=2&home=1&from=ShellLogo>) on 06/10/25 to 07/10/24 to reduce word count.
    - i. I used the prompt(s): Please check and highlight the following text for repetition, redundancy and readability / Hello, I need to cut down my word count. If I paste a section of text, please can you highlight any repetition that I could edit? / I am only interested in trimming and cutting not rephrasing.
    - ii. I confirm that I have not presented any AI generated text as my own work. I confirm that I have copies of my drafts, notes, and other resources I used before, and after the use of AI tools which I may be asked to provide in evidence.
  5. I hereby give consent for my dissertation, if accepted, to be available for photocopying, inter- library loan, and for deposit in the University's digital repository

Signed Laura Martin-Simpson

Date 11/10/25

**Supervisor Declaration.**

I am satisfied that this work is the result of the students' own efforts.

Signed (Supervisor).....Jessica

Pitman.....

Date.....1/10/2025.....

.....

.....

## CONTENTS

<b>DECLARATION FORM .....</b>	2
<b>CONTENTS.....</b>	4
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	8
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	9
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	10
<b>ACRONYMS.....</b>	12
1. INTRODUCTION .....	13
Problem Statement and Significance .....	13
Definitions of Key Terms .....	15
Academic Integrity.....	15
Academic Misconduct .....	16
Global South International Postgraduate Students .....	17
Piloting a Decolonial Analytical Framework .....	17
Research Question, Aims and Objectives.....	18
Structure Overview .....	19
2. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND THE UK UNIVERSITY.....	20
Introduction.....	20
Defining Academic Integrity .....	20
Defining Academic Misconduct .....	22
Historical Context of the UK University .....	23
Academic Integrity in the Contemporary UK University.....	24
Conclusion .....	25
3. THEORETICAL APPROACH.....	25
Introduction.....	25

A Dual Decolonial Theoretical Approach .....	26
Postcolonial Theory (PCT) .....	28
Critical Race Theory (CRT).....	29
Comparative Concepts in PCT and CRT .....	30
Critique of Enlightenment.....	31
Othering and Deficit Thinking Model .....	31
Epistemic Violence and Whiteness as Property.....	32
Coloniality of Power and the Construction of Deviance and Criminality .....	34
Homogeneity and Intersectionality .....	35
Subaltern Silencing and Counter-Storytelling .....	36
Conclusion .....	37
4. METHODOLOGY .....	38
Introduction.....	38
Development of Research Question.....	38
A Critical Lens: Ontology, Epistemology and Methodology .....	39
Criteria for Selecting Literature and Policies.....	40
Literature.....	40
Policies .....	41
Analytical Procedure.....	42
Reflexivity.....	43
Ethical Considerations .....	44
Limitations .....	44
Conclusion .....	45
5. ANALYSIS.....	45
Analysis Introduction.....	45

Part 1: Literature .....	46
Introduction.....	46
Theme 1: Deficit Discourse.....	47
Theme 2: Epistemic Dominance .....	50
Theme 3: Institutional Power.....	54
Theme 4: Identity.....	58
Theme 5: Voice and Agency.....	62
Conclusion .....	67
Part 2: Policies .....	68
Introduction.....	68
Theme 1: Deficit Discourse .....	68
Theme 2: Epistemic Dominance .....	69
Theme 3: Institutional Power.....	71
Theme 4: Identity.....	72
Theme 5: Voice and Agency.....	73
Conclusion .....	75
Analysis Conclusion .....	76
6. DISCUSSION.....	77
Introduction.....	77
Dominant Patterns.....	77
Opacity and Responsibility .....	77
Enlightenment Authority .....	79
Whiteness and Surveillance .....	81
Identity and Agency .....	82
Reflections on the Decolonial Analytical Framework.....	84

Conclusion .....	85
<b>7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>86</b>
Recommendations.....	88
Future Research .....	88
Policy .....	89
Practice.....	89
Towards Epistemic Justice.....	90
<b>8. REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>9. APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>107</b>
a.    Ethics Form.....	107
10.....	127
11.    Outline any anticipated risks that may adversely affect any of the participants, the researchers and/or the University, and the steps that will be taken to address them.	
127	
12.    1.....	127
13.    Full risk assessment completed and appended?.....	127
14.    Yes .....	127
15.    □ .....	127
16.    No.....	127
17.    ☒.....	127
b.    Proposal Form.....	149
c.    Sample of analysis spreadsheet.....	158

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Key Concepts from Postcolonial Theory and Critical Race Theory .....	30
Table 2: Critical Literature Review Selection Criteria .....	41
Table 3: Decolonial Analytical Framework.....	42

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Jessica Pitman, for her belief in both this project and in me. Jess's expert guidance, encouragement, and generosity, gave me the confidence to bring this work to completion.

I am profoundly grateful to my parents and my sister, for their constant love and encouragement. To my partner (through thick and thin), and my friends for their patience, humour, and continual belief in me throughout the rollercoaster of this journey. I also wish to thank my manager and colleagues for their understanding and for championing this dissertation as part of my professional development.

My heartfelt thanks to Alastair Walter and Simon Graham, whose kindness and care were instrumental in maintaining my wellbeing, especially during particularly challenging periods.

And, to my dog, Mona, thank you for your company and our hourly heated debates about if you'd had enough food, you continually reminded me to pause, breathe, and get some fresh air.

This dissertation would not have been possible without the collective support, care, and belief of all those walked beside me.

## ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines how postgraduate Global South international (GSIP) students perceive and experience academic integrity in UK higher education. Academic integrity remains central to university governance and reputation, yet its principles and procedures are often shaped by Eurocentric moral and epistemic traditions that assume neutrality while reproducing inequity. Despite growing interest in international students' experiences, there remains a significant gap in scholarship applying a decolonial critical analysis capable of interrogating UK universities' institutional power structures and epistemic environments. This study addresses that gap by exploring how GSIP students perceive and navigate academic integrity practices and processes and whether these create barriers to equitable learning. Using a dual decolonial theoretical approach, that combines Postcolonial Theory (PCT) (Spivak, 1988; Quijano, 2000; Said, 2003) and Critical Race Theory (CRT) (Crenshaw, 1991; Harris, 1993; Valencia, 2010), this dissertation analyses how colonial legacies and racialised hierarchies continue to shape both research and institutional practice (Mittelmeier *et al.*, 2023). Methodologically, it adopts a critical literature and policy review, drawing on ten qualitative UK studies (the UK Corpus) and three anonymised UK university academic integrity policies. The Decolonial Analytical Framework (DAF) was developed and piloted as a novel analytical tool, synthesising PCT's diachronic critique of colonial hierarchies with CRT's synchronic analysis of race, whiteness, and voice to interrogate how inequities are produced and sustained across literature, policy and methodology.

This dissertation demonstrates that these inequities persist: GSIP students can perceive and experience academic integrity in UK universities as a complex site of compounded exclusions, where deficit discourses, moral suspicion, and punitive approaches continue to position them as conditional or suspect members of academic communities, regardless of whether misconduct is alleged. Academic integrity procedures are experienced as opaque, disciplinary systems that can conflate misunderstanding with dishonesty, while institutional language and surveillance framings perpetuate fear and mistrust. Policies reproduce epistemic dominance by naturalising UK academic integrity conventions as universal, excluding diverse epistemologies and linguistic practices. Across research and governance, GSIP students are often homogenised as "international students" erasing intersectional realities of race, gender and visa

precarity. At the same time, acts of resistance through multilingual counter-storytelling, reflexive scholarship and participatory research, demonstrate emerging pathways toward decolonial practice. Through the DAF, these findings expose how academic integrity discourses can reproduce diachronic colonial legacies and synchronic racialised exclusion, revealing academic integrity as a deeply political question of epistemic justice (Meghji, 2022).

This dissertation concludes that academic integrity cannot remain defined by procedural compliance or assumed neutrality under the guise of Enlightenment ideals. Instead, it must be re-imagined as a site of epistemic and methodological justice; how UK universities legitimise diverse ways of knowing within an increasingly interconnected and rapidly evolving educational landscape. This study contributes a practical framework for embedding decolonial analysis into higher education research, policy and governance. It argues for systemic reform: academic integrity must be decolonised; moving beyond punitive compliance to become collaborative, equitable, and a reflexive practice that fosters belonging and epistemic dignity for GSIP students.

## ACRONYMS

AI	Artificial Intelligence
BEM	Black and Ethnically Minoritised
CRT	Critical Race Theory
DAF	Decolonial Analytical Framework
EDI	Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
ENAI	European Network for Academic Integrity
GN	Global North
GS	Global South
GSI	Global South International
GSIP	Global South International Postgraduate
HE	Higher Education
HEI	Higher Education Institution
ICAI	International Centre for Academic Integrity
IELTS	International English Language Testing System
PCT	Postcolonial Theory
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency
UK	United Kingdom

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## Problem Statement and Significance

The UK remains one of the largest hosts of international students globally. In 2023/24 656,795 international students came from outside the European Union representing around 21% of the total United Kingdom (UK) higher education (HE) student population (Bolton, Lewis and Gower, 2025, p. 4). Global South international postgraduate (GSIP) students account for 39.1% of all UK postgraduates, with the majority of these students being Chinese, Nigerian, and Indian (Universities UK, 2025a). However, while these students make substantial intellectual contributions to the UK HE sector, GSIP students are overrepresented in academic misconduct cases and discourses; a phenomenon documented across Global North (GN) universities for over two decades (Birks *et al.*, 2020; Mbutho and Hutchings, 2021; Vaccino-Salvadore and Buck, 2021; Parnther, 2022). Furthermore, both academic research (Eaton, 2024a) and sector reports (Jisc, 2025; OIAHE, 2025) show that Black and Ethically Minoritised (BEM) international students, who make up the majority of GSIP students in the UK (Universities UK, 2025a), are more likely to be accused of academic misconduct than White international and domestic students.

The question of why BEM GSIP students are more likely to be accused of academic misconduct is fraught with tensions. While sections of the media, particularly right wing press, often frame international students as intentionally cheating (Roe, 2023), sector analysis suggests that racial and structural bias are influential factors. Evidence shows that White students accused of similar offenses can receive more lenient penalties (Weale, 2023). A further dimension lies in a persistent institutional assumption that GSIP students already understand UK academic integrity norms having

completed an undergraduate degree. However, UK academic integrity norms can differ from practices in students' home country universities. Within GN research, this becomes more layered; although many studies begin from the assumptions that GSIP students intentionally engage in misconduct, findings consistently reveal most instances are unintentional, arising from linguistic and academic cultural differences (Smolík and Herbočková, 2021; Vaccino-Salvadore and Buck, 2021; Fadlalmola *et al.*, 2022).

Despite widespread assumptions that UK academic integrity standards are neutral and universal, this dissertation argues that they were developed within colonial and imperial frameworks, with ongoing implications for how they are institutionalised in HE policy and experienced by GSIP students. Most scholarship frames GSIP students through a deficit lens; focusing on assumed academic and ethical shortcomings, delegitimising diverse epistemologies and academic writing practices, and perpetuating exclusionary practices such as Othering (Spivak, 1988; Said, 2003; Fanon, 2021; Lomer and Mittelmeier, 2023). UK HE policies often reinforce this framing by failing to acknowledge differences in academic integrity norms between countries, presenting academic integrity as a mechanism of compliance, rather than a matter of pedagogy and equity, and failing to address the structural inequities that shape GSIP students' experiences. This highlights the urgent need for scholarship that centres GSIP students' perspectives, interrogates both institutional practices and GN academia itself, and reframes academic integrity as a matter of epistemological and social justice. (Eaton, 2022; Hall, Ansley and Connolly, 2023; Adam, 2024; Brooks, 2024).

This dissertation deliberately focuses on UK literature and HE policy analysis rather than new empirical research. This is because few studies centre GSIP student

perceptions and experiences, and institutional policies are central to how academic integrity is coded, monitored and sanctioned. Analysing them, therefore, illuminates how UK academic integrity is positioned within institutions, how it functions as a regulatory practice, and how it is experienced by GSIP students.

This dissertation contributes to filling this gap in literature by offering three crucial interventions. It shows how UK universities can make academic integrity practices and processes inclusive, equitable, and context sensitive; it extends scholarship by offering a Decolonial Analytical Framework (DAF), embedding academic integrity within Postcolonial (PCT) and Critical Race Theory (CRT); and it repositions GSIP students from suspects to co-authors of academic integrity. In a sector reliant on GSIP students but complicit in their marginalisation, this study is both timely and ethically necessary.

## **Definitions of Key Terms**

### **Academic Integrity**

While there is no single definition of academic integrity (Eaton, 2024c), it is widely regarded as academia's moral and professional compass (Bretag and Mahmud, 2016): a code of practice that assures quality (Barnett, 1994) and clarifies how the academic community, including university students, conduct scholarship. This dissertation argues that these definitions, far from being neutral, are underpinned by culturally normative values such as, 'honesty, fairness, trust, respect and responsibility' (International Centre for Academic Integrity (ICAI), 2025), which stem from Eurocentric epistemologies and Enlightenment ideals. This dissertation uses the following definition

Academic Integrity is one of the most important principles in Higher Education and research. By working with Academic Integrity all members of the university contribute to a culture that is honest, transparent and respectful, maintaining the integrity of a student's work and their award. Academic integrity is based on the ethos that how you learn is as important as what you learn. For you as a student, Academic Integrity means that your work must be a result of your own research and ideas. Information taken from other sources must be fully acknowledged, whether it is directly quoted, paraphrased or summarised. (Swansea University, no date)

Chapter Two explores the complexity of diverse definitions of academic integrity in more detail.

## **Academic Misconduct**

Academic misconduct refers to practices that deviate from academic integrity principles. There is no single definition. This dissertation adopts:

Any action by a student which gives or has the potential to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment, or might assist someone else to gain an unfair advantage, or any activity likely to undermine the integrity essential to scholarship and research. (UWTSD, 2022, p. 2)

## **Global South International Postgraduate Students**

This dissertation focuses on Global South International Postgraduate (GSIP) students; a term that requires unpacking.

The terms Global North (GN) and Global South (GS) highlight asymmetries of power, privilege, and epistemic authority that shape GN HE (Mignolo, 2011). For this dissertation, GN refers to ‘hegemonic forces that dominate global structures through economic flows, powerful forms of meaning-making and/or explicit coercive measures’ (Haug, Braveboy-Wagner and Maihold, 2021, p. 1929). The GS refers to, ‘systemic inequalities stemming from the ‘colonial encounter’ and the continuing reverberations of European colonialism and imperialism but also the potential of alternative sources of power and knowledge’ (Haug, Braveboy-Wagner and Maihold, 2021, p. 1928)

While the term ‘international students’ homogenises diversity and obscures structural inequities (Mittelmeier *et al.*, 2023), it remains necessary to use because of its prevalence in academic and policy discourses. Where used, it refers to students domiciled outside of the UK, who reside in the UK for at least 12 months to study (ONS, 2025). A postgraduate student is someone who is studying for a doctoral, master, or postgraduate certificates (ONS, 2025).

## **Piloting a Decolonial Analytical Framework**

This study adopts a dual theoretical approach, combining Postcolonial Theory (PCT) and Critical Race Theory (CRT). PCT provides historical depth, analysing how colonial legacies shape contemporary practices, while CRT enables analysis of racialisation, power and exclusion today.

The key contribution of this dissertation is the piloting of a Decolonial Analytical Framework (DAF). Rather than treating academic integrity as neutral and universal, the DAF analyses systemic and structural conditions and epistemic injustice, enabling redistribution of authority and recognition of GSIP students as epistemic agents rather than deficient outsiders. The DAF implements this critique through five themes: deficit discourses, epistemic dominance, institutional power, identity, and voice and agency.

Applying the DAF to both scholarship and policy tests its analytical utility and offers potential for refinement in future doctoral research. Findings from this pilot not only address the present research aims but also highlight conceptual and methodological gaps, particularly the need for, multilingual design, participatory co-production and intersectional GSIP student data collection and analysis, that future empirical projects could address. Therefore, this dissertation operates as both a critique of current practices and a roadmap for future decolonial scholarship.

## **Research Question, Aims and Objectives**

Research Question:

How do postgraduate Global South international students studying in the UK perceive and experience academic integrity?

Research Aims:

1. To identify the perceptions and experiences of postgraduate international students regarding academic integrity within the context of UK higher education system.

2. To investigate whether UK academic integrity processes may pose barriers to the learning experience of postgraduate international students.

Research objectives:

1. To critically conduct a comparative analysis of relevant and significant current literature that explores the perceptions and experiences of Global South international postgraduate students who have studied in the UK.
2. To conduct a short comparative critical content analysis of academic integrity policy documents from three different universities.
3. To identify gaps in current literature and provide recommendations for future research.

## **Structure Overview**

This dissertation is organised into seven chapters. Chapter Two contextualises academic integrity within UK universities, discusses definitions and outlines institutional practices and procedures. Chapter Three presents the dual theoretical approach (PCT and CRT). Chapter Four details the methodology, including the DAF. Chapter Five applies the DAF to the literature and policies, analysed and structured around five themes. Chapter Six synthesises these analyses and discusses dominant patterns. Chapter Seven concludes with a summary of the findings and recommendations for future research, policy and practice.

## 2. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND THE UK

### UNIVERSITY

#### Introduction

This chapter contextualises academic integrity within the historical and contemporary landscape of UK HE. It traces the moral and epistemic foundations of the UK university, from medieval Christian ethics through Enlightenment rationality and colonial expansion, to the shifting practices of the present day. By situating academic integrity within these frameworks, the chapter establishes the enduring symbiotic dynamics between knowledge, morality, and power. This provides the necessary grounding for the next chapter which develops the dissertation's decolonial theoretical approach.

#### Defining Academic Integrity

As previously discussed, through there is no single definition of academic integrity, it is commonly framed as the moral and professional foundation of academia, encapsulating the principles that govern ethical scholarship and quality assurance (Barnett, 1994; Bretag and Mahmud, 2016). Yet, academic integrity is framed around Eurocentric culturally normative values, the ICAI (2025) defines these values as 'honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage'. While the European Network for Academic Integrity's (ENAI) definition emphasises adherence to professional principles and consistent value systems

Compliance with ethical and professional principles, standards, practices and consistent systems of values, that serves as guidance for making

decisions and taking actions in education, research and scholarship. (Gaižauskaitė *et al.*, 2020, p. 7).

In the UK, the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA, 2024) adopts ENAI's definition and while UK universities retain the autonomy to define academic integrity locally, they invariably use an amalgamation of the ENAI and ICAI definitions (Queen Mary University, 2022; Oxford Brookes University, 2024; University of Cambridge, 2025).

Some scholars argue that the diversity and complexity of definitions allows universities to tailor academic integrity to their specific institutional contexts in order to maintain high standards (Sefcik, Striepe and Yorke, 2020; Fadlalmola *et al.*, 2022; Mukasa, Stokes and Mukona, 2023). While others warn it obscures expectations, creating confusion for students and undermining equitable learning experiences and outcomes (Draper and Boland, 2024; Harrad, Keasley and Jefferies, 2024; Perkins and Roe, 2024). For GSIP students themselves, the plurality of definitions can mean that academic integrity norms at UK universities are neither obvious nor align with students' prior academic experience (Ploner and Nada, 2020a; Cutri *et al.*, 2021; Eaton, 2024b). Mejía and Garcés-Flórez (2025) contend that debates around definitions, reveal academic integrity to be a practice shaped by cultural assumptions, disciplinary norms and institutional power.

## Defining Academic Misconduct

As previously discussed and defined, academic misconduct refers to practices that deviate from academic integrity principles. Again, there is no single definition, but practices defined as academic misconduct across UK universities include:

- Plagiarism: presenting someone else's work or ideas as the student's own.
- Self-plagiarism: submitting work the student has already submitted for another assessment.
- Collusion:: working with someone else on an assessment but presenting as the student's own work.
- Falsifying data, evidence or experimental results.
- False Authorship: someone or something completing work for a student who then submits it as their own e.g. essay writing services, and unpermitted use of AI to generate material. (UWTSD, 2022, p. 2)

In UK HE, plagiarism remains the most prevalent form of academic misconduct (Grove, 2024). However, recent data indicates a decline in plagiarism and a rise in contract cheating and the misuse of artificial intelligence (AI) (Grove, 2024; Young, 2024; Goodier, 2025).

Academic misconduct by UK GSIP students can be either intentional or unintentional (Lomer and Mittelmeier, 2023; Stone, 2023; Sweeney, 2023). Irrespective of intent, both the UK academic community, and wider society, judge academic misconduct as

intentional deviance, a serious violation of personal integrity and a threat to the academic integrity, value and reputation of UK universities (Mbutho and Hutchings, 2021; Tan and Carnegie, 2022; Mukasa, Stokes and Mukona, 2023; Draper and Boland, 2024; Harrad, Keasley and Jefferies, 2024; MacLachlan, 2024)

## **Historical Context of the UK University**

To understand academic integrity within UK HE, it is necessary to situate it within the historical development of the UK university. Originating in the medieval era, Oxford and Cambridge universities were established as elite spaces that combined Christian theology, morals, and ethics with philosophy and scholarship, the first students were monks (Barnett, 1994; Delanty, 1998; van der Lugt, 2018).

The Enlightenment further cemented UK universities as arbiters of measurable scientific universal knowledge , in pursuit of ideals such as “rationality”, “authenticity”, “truth”, “integrity” and “humanity” (Scott, 1993; Honderich, 2005). This epistemic shift embedded the authority of universities as both the sole producers of legitimate knowledge and the moral guardians of society (Blackmore, 2001; Fitzpatrick, 2004; Biesta, 2007). However, Enlightenment epistemology is neither universal nor neutral (Ogle, 2003; Carey and Festa, 2009). As Hall (1995, p. 314) argues it created a conceptual framework in which ‘the West’ symbolised progress, civilisation, and modernity, while ‘the Rest’ provided a vital and highly racialised ‘reverse image of enlightenment and modernity’. Crucially, the Enlightenment was simultaneous with colonial domination and the transatlantic slave trade, and UK universities played a central role in, educating colonial administrators and enslavers, financially benefiting from slave trade profits, codifying hierarchies of knowledge, and exporting

Enlightenment epistemologies worldwide (Anderson, 2004; Mignolo, 2011; Bhambra, 2014; Sharpe, 2019; Foste, 2020).

This dissertation contends that, even today, academic integrity discourses in the UK remain inseparable from UK universities' epistemological legacies of Christian morality and Enlightenment ideals.

## **Academic Integrity in the Contemporary UK University**

The QAA (2024) promotes academic integrity standards through its Charter, but it does not prescribe definitions or monitoring mechanisms. Myer and Smith (2024) contend that while leaving the practice and governing of academic integrity to individual institutions protects autonomy and academic freedom, it also creates significant variation in how academic integrity is taught, monitored and enforced, risking inequitable student experiences.

In practice, contemporary UK universities monitor and enforce academic integrity through a combination of pedagogy, policies, procedures, plagiarism detection technologies, such as Turnitin, and disciplinary mechanisms. Typical academic misconduct processes involve staff reporting suspected misconduct, panel hearings, offers of academic writing support, and penalties ranging from warnings to expulsion (Stoesz and Eaton, 2022; Draper and Boland, 2024; Foltýnek and Glendinning, 2024). The academic integrity environment is rapidly evolving, the proportion of students in the UK using AI tools for assessments has increased from 53% in 2024 to 88% in 2025 adding a further complex layer to academic integrity discourse and UK universities' practices and procedures (HEPI, 2025).

## **Conclusion**

Academic integrity in the UK is not a neutral or fixed construct but one embedded within centuries of moral, epistemic and institutional authority. While definitions and processes vary across institutions, they are consistently grounded in Enlightenment ideals of truth, honesty, and universal knowledge. These epistemic legacies, which are inextricably linked with colonial and racial hierarchies, continue to influence how academic integrity is defined, taught, and governed. The following chapter sets out this dissertation's decolonial theoretical approach by using PCT and CRT to interrogate whether these legacies have an impact on GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity at UK universities.

## **3. THEORETICAL APPROACH**

### **Introduction**

This chapter sets out the theoretical approach for this dissertation. It begins by arguing that, to answer the research question, a dual decolonial approach is essential. It outlines this study's dual theoretical approach, which combines Postcolonial Theory (PCT) and Critical Race Theory (CRT) to provide both historical (diachronic) depth and contemporary (synchronic) analytical detail, situating GSIP students' perceptions and experiences within both historical context and present-day power imbalances. Finally, the chapter examines key comparative concepts and establishes the analytical themes that underpin this study.

## A Dual Decolonial Theoretical Approach

A decolonial theoretical approach is central to answering the research question of how GSIP students studying in the UK perceive and experience academic integrity. GN scholarship highlights tensions between Global South International (GSI) students and GN higher education institutions (HEIs), that often frame students through deficit lenses, focusing on fixing perceived academic weaknesses in individuals rather than addressing systemic inequities (Birks *et al.*, 2020; Ploner and Nada, 2020b; Cutri *et al.*, 2021; Sanni-Anibire *et al.*, 2021; Vaccino-Salvadore and Buck, 2021; Gregory, 2021; Kim and Uysal, 2021; Mbutho and Hutchings, 2021; Parnther, 2022; Tran, Hogg and Marshall, 2022; Eaton, 2022; McGregor *et al.*, 2022; McKenna, 2022; Moosavi, 2022; Lomer and Mittelmeier, 2023). Some studies identify racism as shaping GSI students' academic experiences (Mbutho and Hutchings, 2021; McGregor *et al.*, 2022), while others expose how GSI students' academic integrity practices are problematised through deviance discourses by focusing on violations of perceived academic norms (Kim and Uysal, 2021; Sanni-Anibire *et al.*, 2021). These studies recommend analysing academic integrity within broader colonial and racialised power dynamics.

Decolonial approaches emphasise both the persistence of colonial hierarchies and the contemporary reproduction of racialised inequities. Ploner and Nada (2020a) and Parnther (2022) argue that GSI students' experiences of academic integrity are structured by postcolonial heritages of Eurocentric epistemic dominance. Moosavi (2022, p. 465) who synthesises PCT and CRT, defines a 'decolonial theoretical approach' as

A synthesis of postcolonialism, which recognises the continued importance of colonial hierarchies in shaping the present, as well as critical race theory, which seeks to dismantle the socially constructed pervasiveness of racial categorisations and their associated hierarchies.

(Moosavi, 2022)

Shakun *et al.* (2024) warn that PCT's systemic scale may be difficult to correlate with CRT's focus on lived experiences. However, Meghji, (2020, p. 660) counters that synergising PCT and CRT reflects the complexity and pluralism of lived realities. While there are temporal tensions between PCT, which focuses on historical legacies and CRT, which focuses on contemporary racism, Solórzano and Yosso, (2002, p. 4 ) argue that using CRT within a transdisciplinary perspective enables simultaneous analysis of both historic and contemporary racism. This study mitigates against these tensions by employing two distinct temporal tiers: PCT diachronically and CRT synchronically.

In summary, adopting a decolonial approach allows this study to interrogate the extent to which Eurocentric and racialised hegemonies of knowledge and legitimacy shape GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity in UK HE. As Abdulrahman *et al.*, (2021) contend, only by engaging with decolonial critique can research move beyond merely describing student barriers and towards exposing systemic dynamics that obstruct equitable participation. Additionally, adopting a duel theoretical framework that combines PCT and CRT mitigates both ahistoricism and presentism, a synergy that R'boul (2022) argues is essential for analysing education in

a postcolonial globalised world. The following sections explore the distinct contributions of both PCT and CRT in further detail.

## **Postcolonial Theory (PCT)**

PCT interrogates how colonial legacies continue to shape contemporary cultural, political and epistemological structures and systems (Moosavi, 2022). For this study, PCT is defined as:

An umbrella term that covers different critical approaches which deconstruct European thought...In this perspective, the term postcolonial refers not to a simple periodization but rather to a methodological revisionism which enables a wholesale critique of Western structures of knowledge and power, particularly those of the post-Enlightenment period. (Mongia, 2021, p. 2).

In GN HE research, PCT has been used to analyse how GSI students' experiences are shaped by uneven power dynamics and to interrogate how GN HE systems, pedagogy, and knowledge production are structured by Eurocentric assumptions that marginalise GS epistemologies (Andreotti, 2011; Bamberger, 2022; Bhati, 2023; Biswas, 2023; Heleta and Chasi, 2023). Recent scholarship extends this analysis to GN academic integrity practices, highlighting how plagiarism discourses and universal academic integrity norms can reproduce colonial hierarchies of legitimisation (Bamberger and Morris, 2024; Lootens and Fúnez-Flores, 2024; Yin, 2024).

In this study, PCT provides a diachronic lens to explore how GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity are situated within colonial heritages of knowledge and power in UK HE.

## **Critical Race Theory (CRT)**

CRT originated in the 1970's through the work of BEM legal scholars who exposed how racism persisted beyond the civil rights era. CRT argues that racism is systemic, and embedded within the structures of law and society (Crenshaw *et al.*, 1995). Its core tenets include: racism as ordinary within everyday life; interest convergence, whereby reform occurs only when it serves dominant White interests; race as a social construct, created by White dominant groups to validate skin colour hierarchies; intersectionality and anti-essentialism; and the amplification of marginalised voices and perspectives (Delgado and Stefancic, 2023, p. 9).

In educational research, CRT was advanced by Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) and has since provided a framework to analyse how racial hierarchies are reproduced and experienced through curriculum, policy, institutional processes, and scholarship (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Solorzano, Ceja and Yosso, 2000; Solórzano and Yosso, 2002). Key contributions include exposing colour-blind liberalism (Decuir and Dixson, 2004; Harper, 2012), documenting how race structures access to education and belonging (Chadderton, 2013; Patton, 2016), and developing counter-storytelling as an epistemic practice (Christian, Seamster and Ray, 2021; Bedford and Shaffer, 2023; Lin, 2023; Cabrera *et al.*, 2024).

Within this study, CRT provides a synchronic lens for exploring how GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity are shaped by race, whiteness, and silencing within UK HE.

## Comparative Concepts in PCT and CRT

Although PCT and CRT have different theoretical origins, they share comparative concepts that taken together, enable analysis of how GSIP students are positioned within UK academic integrity practices, and clarify how historical hierarchies and contemporary racialisation converge across pedagogy, scholarship and policy. Underpinned by the work of Meghji (2022) and Moosavi (2022) the following table illustrates key concepts from each theory that this dissertation combines.

*Table 1: Key Concepts from Postcolonial Theory and Critical Race Theory*

Diachronic Tier	Synchronic Tier
Postcolonial Theory	Critical Race Theory
Relevant Key Concepts	Relevant Key Concepts
Critique of Enlightenment	Critique of Enlightenment
Othering	Deficit thinking model
Epistemic violence	Whiteness as property
Coloniality of power	Construction of deviance and criminality
Homogeneity	Intersectionality
Subaltern silencing	Counter-Storytelling

## **Critique of Enlightenment**

A core concept shared by both PCT and CRT is their critique of Enlightenment universalism. Through a PCT lens, “universal reason” is revealed as a specifically European cultural academic construct exported through empire, institutionalising Eurocentric epistemic and moral dominance (Spivak, 1988; Said, 2003; Fanon, 2021). Mignolo, (2011) links this to the colonial “civilising mission”, while Chakrabarty (2021, p. 241) argues that Enlightenment rationality was made to ‘appear self-evident far beyond its historical grounding’. PCT scholarship demonstrates how the colonial Eurocentric state, church and university established control over GS knowledge production, a pattern that R’boul (2022) and Hegde and Inamdar (2023) argue is reproduced today in the internationalisation of GN HE.

Comparatively, CRT argues that Enlightenment notions of reason and progress, despite being assumed neutral, align whiteness with truth and pathologises BEM peoples (Crenshaw *et al.*, 1995; Mills, 1997; Delgado and Stefancic, 2023). Within the context of academic integrity, Savas (2014) contends that this manifests in juridical punitive systems that privilege compliance over epistemic plurality.

## **Othering and Deficit Thinking Model**

In PCT, Said's (2003, p. 2) theory of ‘Orientalism’ or ‘Othering’ shows how colonialised people and their epistemologies were pathologised as inferior and irrational. Othering continues to shape GSI students’ positioning in GN HE; GSI students report ‘Othered institutional status’ and marginalisation in everyday university interactions (Bamberger, 2022; Page, 2022; Tavares, 2024). Heng and Lu (2023) find

that Chinese GSI students are stereotyped as academically passive or lacking, while Roe (2023) finds how UK media narratives, by racialising contract cheating, attach dishonesty to GSI students.

Within CRT educational research, Valencia's (2010) deficit thinking model offers a synchronic equivalent to Othering; explanations for low achievement, such as lack of motivation and culture, locate problems within BEM students' themselves, minimising the role of structural inequity. Studies show that HE pedagogic discourse routinely casts GSI students as deficient in academic integrity and agency (Jindal-Snape, 2023; Lomer, Mittelmeier and Courtney, 2023; Lomer, Taha and Hayes, 2023). However, counter-findings highlight agency and resilience: Bai and Wang (2024), find that GSI students at a UK university draw on cultural capital through community, while Shimomura (2024) centres counter-stories that document structural racism within a UK university. Tran, Hogg and Marshall (2022) further emphasise the intersectionality of GSIP students' experiences.

Taken together, PCT's contribution of Othering explains how GSIP students can be cast as culturally and academically "foreign", while CRT's deficit thinking model clarifies how this "foreignness" can be institutionally recoded as GSIP student deficit.

## **Epistemic Violence and Whiteness as Property**

Within PCT, Spivak (1988) theorises epistemic violence as the subordination of diverse GS knowledge systems under colonial rule. Studies show that this persists in GN HE where GSI students' academic practices are often delegitimised or rendered invisible. For example, Ploner and Nada (2020a, p. 379) find that GSI students report

‘discriminatory epistemic violence’ that erodes belonging, while Sikka and Proctor (2024) argue that GN HE acculturative presumptions and practices reproduce epistemic injustice. Zembylas (2025) contends that these exclusions harm GSI students’ learning experiences and wellbeing.

Comparatively, CRT’s concept of whiteness as property (Harris, 1993, p. 1721) explains the racialised structure of such exclusion; dominant groups retain proprietary control over what counts as valid, valuable and legitimate, that ‘Whites alone possess’.

Focusing on GS scholarship in GN publishing Okello (2023, p. 1) terms this exclusionary practice ‘epistemic asphyxiation’. Within educational research Pham (2023) calls this ‘truth as White property’; Cabrera *et al.* (2024) trace its institutional reach within GN HE; while Rizvi (2022) and Bennett *et al.* (2023) evidence its inequitable impacts on GSI and First Nation students in Australian HE. Within the academic integrity landscape, Cutri *et al.* (2021) highlight how GSIP doctoral students in Australia, can experience imposter syndrome and accusations of academic misconduct due to the exclusivity of GN academic norms.

For this study, PCT reveals the historical arc of epistemic violence, while CRT demonstrates how proprietary whiteness continues to police the boundaries of legitimate academic practice.

## **Coloniality of Power and the Construction of Deviance and Criminality**

Quijano's (2000, p. 216) concept of the 'coloniality of power' conceptualises how, in a post-colonial world Eurocentric hierarchy of identity, knowledge, and emotional labour endure. A body of GN literature theorises that contemporary HE reproduces these hierarchies (Gandhi, 2020; Mongia, 2021; Kumar H.M., 2023). Yin (2024) contends that GN HE perpetuates oppression though internationalised power conscious structures, while Brown (2023) and Crichlow (2023) argue that academic practices import penal logics, rebranding colonial disciplines as neutral reform.

CRT adds the synchronic layer by revealing how deviance is produced and racialised in the present. Delgado and Stefancic (2023), theorise that racialised deviance and criminality are constructed to legitimise hierarchy, while Cabrera *et al.*(2024) argue that whiteness, as an institutionalised norm in GN HE, positions racialised GSI students as inherently suspect.

Empirical studies consistently demonstrate how GN academic integrity processes can criminalise linguistic diversity, Vaccino-Salvadore and Buck (2021) show that restricted ownership of academic English is often framed as academic misconduct rather than a pedagogical need. Cutri *et al.* (2021) and Kim and Uysal (2021) illustrate how learning becomes surveillance: GSI students describe feeling constantly monitored and fearful of transgression. The teaching of academic integrity frequently adopts policing frames; a set of rules to avoid sanction, rather than holistic learning (Shoyukhi *et al.*, 2023). Academic integrity procedures are often reported as intimidating and shaming, fostering fear and reputational harm, rather than educational

development (Birks *et al.*, 2020, Stone 2023 and Sweeney 2023). Birks *et al.*, (2020, p. 1) further highlight that while forms of academic misconduct continue to ‘mutate’ as AI evolves, institutional responses remain narrowly punitive, disproportionately impacting GSIP students.

Together, PCT’s diachronic focus on colonial power and CRT synchronic theorisation of racialised deviance and criminality, coproduce a GN HE environment in which GSIP students experience academic integrity as a mechanism of surveillance and punishment rather than as an equitable learning experience.

## **Homogeneity and Intersectionality**

PCT critiques essentialism as a Eurocentric colonial construct that reduces complex identities into fixed cultural characteristics, creating a binary between ‘them’ and ‘us’ (Hall, 1995; Spivak, 1999; Said, 2003, p. 7; Bhabha, 2012). In GN scholarship, GSI students are often homogenised into the monolithic and academically inferior category of ‘international students’ (Kim and Uysal, 2021; Sanni-Anibire *et al.*, 2021; Moosavi, 2022; Tran, Hogg and Marshall, 2022; Lomer and Mittelmeier, 2023; Denisova-Schmidt, 2024). Tran, Hogg and Marshall (2022), contest this essentialist framing, showing that Vietnamese GSIP students experience academic integrity in highly differentiated ways.

Within CRT, Crenshaw’s (1991) theory of intersectionality synchronically challenges this homogeneity by examining the compound impacts of ‘how race, sex, class, national origin and additional marginalised identities play out in various settings’ (Delgado and Stefancic, 2023, p. 59). Contemporary scholarship corroborates this by revealing how

multiple, institutionally unacknowledged oppressions, including gender, race, visa precarity, and caring responsibilities compound GSI students' inequitable experiences of academic integrity (Mbutho and Hutchings, 2021; Glass, Heng and Hou, 2022; Dickson, Bradley and Read, 2024; Mei Hu, 2024; Yin, 2024). Brunsting *et al.* (2024, p. 149) and Bannister, Peñalver and Urbina (2024, p. 153) further find that GSIP students' intersectional identities remain invisible in GN HE academic integrity policy, underscoring the need for inclusive policy reform.

This dissertation combines, PCT's diachronic critique of homogenisation, which reveals GSIP students' diverse yet overlooked identities, with CRT's synchronic framework of intersectionality, which exposes the compounded oppressions shaping students' experiences. Together, these perspectives illuminate how intersecting identities influence GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity.

## **Subaltern Silencing and Counter-Storytelling**

Spivak (1988, p. 28) argues that 'the subaltern cannot speak', conceptualising how colonial structures render marginalised voices illegitimate within dominant epistemic hierarchies. Fanon (2021) extends this theory revealing how colonial violence psychologically internalises silence, while Tuhiwai Smith (2022) critiques GN research traditions that extract knowledge without recognising Indigenous and GS voices. These dynamics are reproduced in contemporary GN HE: Lootens and Fúnez-Flores (2024) and Memon and Jivraj (2024) document how the diverse voices of racialised GSIP students in UK universities are silenced, and how some students' strategically self-silence to avoid punishment. Within academic integrity scholarship, Gregory (2021) argues that GN HE policies impose a 'social contract' between

institution and GSI student, despite GSI students often not being fully aware of the rules and therefore being unable to give informed consent.

Comparatively, CRT offers counter-storytelling as a means for resisting these mechanisms of silencing. Solórzano and Yosso (2002, p. 32) define counter-storytelling as a methodology that amplifies narratives which disrupt majoritarian accounts of racial privilege. Mahmud (2024, p. 859) demonstrates this by amplifying Muslim doctoral students' experiences of Islamophobia in UK HE, showing that, contrary to institutional equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) narratives, participants felt their voices were not genuinely listened to, exposing the pervasiveness of racism. Bedford and Shaffer (2023), Dutta, Azad and Hussain (2022) and Masutha, Rajani and Enders (2024) all use counter-storytelling to challenge racialised deficit discourses within GN education.

Taken together, PCT's theory of subaltern silencing diachronically exposes how GSIP students can be silenced within academic integrity discourses and practices, while CRT's counter-storytelling synchronically amplifies resistance and epistemic agency.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter has established why a dual decolonial theoretical approach is central to answering the research question. By combining PCT's diachronic critique of colonial legacies with CRT's synchronic analysis of racialisation and whiteness, the study avoids both ahistoricism and presentism. Comparative PCT and CRT concepts enable interrogation of how GSIP students perceive and experience academic integrity at UK universities, as well as how students are framed within academic integrity scholarship

and policy. While dual theorisation presents some risks, a tiered temporal perspective ensures coherence (Thomas, 2000; Shakun *et al.*, 2024). The following chapter details how this decolonial theoretical approach is realised methodologically.

## 4. METHODOLOGY

### Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodological foundations of this dissertation, which adopts a critical and decolonial lens to examine how GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity are constructed within UK scholarship and HE. It begins by tracing the development of the research questions before situating the study's ontological, epistemological, and methodological stance. The chapter then details the criteria for selecting literature and policy sources, explains the application of the Decolonial Analytical Framework (DAF) as theoretically explored in the previous chapter, and discusses the reflexivity, ethical considerations, and limitations that shape the study's validity and critical scope.

### Development of Research Question

The research question for this dissertation evolved during the study design. Initially, the dissertation aimed to explore how GSIP students perceive and experience academic integrity in the UK, through a case study of Nigerian GSIP students, given that a significant proportion of GSIP students in the UK are Nigerian (Bolton, Lewis and Gower, 2024). However, while scholarship on academic integrity in Nigerian HE is extensive (Eteng *et al.*, 2024; Oji and Ochuko, 2024; Tsenongu, Okwu and Obande,

2024), there were few studies addressing Nigerian GSIP students within the UK context. Constructing such a case study risked speculation, which decolonial methodology rejects (Spivak, 1988; Meghji, 2022; Tuhiwai Smith, 2022). The research question was therefore refined to focus on GSIP students more broadly, while remaining attentive to the risk of reproducing homogeneity.

## **A Critical Lens: Ontology, Epistemology and Methodology**

This review is grounded in a critical ontology and epistemology, viewing human interaction and knowledge production as embedded within unequal societal power relations (Lincoln, Lynham, and Guba, 2011). A critical lens is essential for examining GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity, as it facilitates interrogation of how GSIP students are represented within Eurocentric epistemologies, UK HE policies and practices, and GN scholarship more broadly (Sefcik, Striepe and Yorke, 2020; Eaton, 2024c). More specifically, this dissertation adopts a decolonial epistemology, challenging the hegemony of GN academia by interrogating the assumptions, motivations, and values underpinning research practice (Tuhiwai Smith, 2022; B Oyinloye and Zhang, 2023). This critical, decolonial orientation foregrounds the structural nature of epistemic dominance and enables analysis of how coloniality, race, and institutional power shape GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity in UK HE (Bhambra, 2014; Moosavi, 2022; Heleta and Chasi, 2023).

Methodologically, this dissertation employs a critical literature review facilitating a purposeful and engaged reading of the contemporary literature (Grant and Booth, 2009; Snyder, 2019). Within educational research, this methodology positions the researcher

as an active interpreter; interrogating how studies construct knowledge through ideological lenses (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017) and uncovering how assumptions, silences, and methodological choices reproduce or contest power relations, potentially marginalising minority voices and naturalising inequities (Turin *et al.*, 2016). Aligning with the research aims, this critical methodology ensures that the review not only synthesises evidence but also evaluates whether academic integrity frameworks support or obstruct equitable participation.

## **Criteria for Selecting Literature and Policies**

### **Literature**

An initial pilot search identified a scarcity of UK studies on GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity. Search terms were therefore broadened to include 'academic misconduct' and 'plagiarism' alongside 'academic integrity'. Searches were conducted across ProQuest Central, EBSCO, Google Scholar and major publisher platforms such as Springer, and Taylor & Francis, as well as grey literature (AdvanceHE, 2025; Jisc, 2025; QAA, 2025).

The below table documents the selection criteria for the literature and is developed from the work of Lomer and Mittelmeier (2023, p. 1245). Full text screening yielded a purposive sample of ten studies, hereafter referred to as the 'UK Corpus' enabling comparative critical analysis (Saunders and Rojon, 2011).

Table 2: Critical Literature Review Selection Criteria

Critical Literature Review Selection Criteria		
	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
1.	Published in a peer-reviewed journal	Published outside a peer-reviewed journal
2.	Data collected in UK	Data collected outside the UK
3.	Qualitative empirical data	Quantitative data or literature review
4.	Empirical engagement focused on academic integrity and/or academic misconduct in UK HEIs.	Empirical engagement focused outside of academic integrity and/or academic misconduct and/or outside of UK HEIs
5.	Included international students in rationale or research design and population sample.	Did not include international students in rationale or research design and population sample.
6.	Published between 2021 and 2025	Published before 2021

In addition to selecting the UK Corpus, the same process was used to identify studies from the wider GN field (outside of the UK) to provide contextual comparison during analysis.

## Policies

A rapid scan of academic integrity policies across the University Alliance institutions was conducted (Ganann, Ciliska and Thomas, 2010). University Alliance institutions were selected to ensure consistency in institutional focus, sector positioning and their high numbers of GSIP students (University Alliance, no date; Universities UK, 2024). Three policies were then purposively selected for comparative depth, incorporating variation in length, tone, and procedures (Creswell, 2013). All three policies are publicly available formal governance documents.

## Analytical Procedure

The analytical procedure combined a structured, evaluative and thematic approach.

First, the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP, 2024) checklist was used to assess the methodological quality and transparency of each study in the UK Corpus.

Building on this, the Decolonial Analytical Framework (DAF) was applied to interrogate both the studies and the institutional policies. The DAF, developed from the dual theoretical foundations of PCT and CRT, draws inspiration from the work of Bedford and Shaffer (2023) and Shakun *et al.* (2024). It not only enables a critique of exclusionary practice but also constitutes a novel contribution to the literature, addressing a significant research gap and providing a pilot model for how decolonial praxis can be systematically applied.

Table 3: Decolonial Analytical Framework

Theme		Key Theoretical Concepts		Guide decolonial question
		PCT Diachronic Tier	CRT Synchronic Tier	
1	Deficit discourse	Othering	Deficit thinking model	‘To what extent does [the] research focus on deficits, challenges, or problems of international students, and who or what does it problematize?’ (Lomer, Taha and Hayes, 2023, p. 77)
2	Epistemic dominance	Epistemic violence	Whiteness as property	‘How has [the] framing of the research ‘problem’ been shaped by colonial [epistemic] assumptions?’ (Lomer, Taha and Hayes, 2023, p. 77)
3	Institutional power	Coloniality of power, epistemic injustice	Institutional racism, construction of deviance and criminality	To what extent does the research ‘critically examine the [institutional] structures of domination and oppression and how they are embedded?’ (Udah, 2023, p. 70)
4	Identity	Homogeneity Anti- Essentialism	Intersectionality Anti- Essentialism	‘How does [the] research incorporate understandings of racialisation and intersectionality?’ (Lomer, Taha and Hayes, 2023, p. 77)
5	Voice and agency	Subaltern silencing	Counter storytelling	To what extent does the research ‘centre international students as agents, empowered, and central to knowledge creation?’ (Lomer, Taha and Hayes, 2023, p. 77)

Practically, the analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2022, p. 53) principles of thematic analysis. Sections of the studies were coded thematically and colour labelled, while overlaps were highlighted to reflect the complexity of GSIP experiences (see Appendix C for sample of analysis spreadsheet). This iterative, reflective process enabled a critical analytical synthesis of colonial legacies and contemporary racialised inequalities.

## **Reflexivity**

My positionality as a researcher is central to this study, and I occupy both insider and outsider roles (Mercer, 2007). As an EDI professional working at a UK university, not the university at which I undertook this Master's degree, I have a professional awareness of the disproportionate representation of GSIP students in academic misconduct cases while retaining institutional distance. I am also of mixed ethnic background which requires acknowledgement of both the potential 'white saviour' risks and the responsibilities of whiteness within decolonial praxis; this includes citing GS and Indigenous scholars, challenging the presumed neutrality of GN scholarship, whilst simultaneously recognising my own positionality within UK HE structures (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Moosavi, 2022; Tuhiwai Smith, 2022).

I am a British woman educated within the UK system, I have experienced the complexity and opacity of academic integrity norms, though from a position of privilege. Reflexivity is treated throughout this study as a continuous practice; accordingly I maintained a reflexive journal to monitor how my assumptions,

interpretations, and positionality shaped the analytical interpretation. (Adriansen and Spangler, 2023).

## **Ethical Considerations**

Although this study is a literature review with no direct participants, ethical engagement remains essential. Ethical approval was granted by UWTSD Ethics Committee (Appendix a). Institutional policies were anonymised (Policies A, B, and C) to avoid reputational risk and to foreground systemic rather than institutional issues (Oliver, 2010; Shore and Wright, 2011).

Given the researcher's professional role, British Educational Research Association (2024) guidelines informed safeguards around political and institutional sensitivities. Reflexive distancing was maintained throughout to ensure that interpretations of the scholarship and policy did not compromise professional relationships or institutional reputations.

## **Limitations**

This dissertation acknowledges several limitations. Literature reviews risk abstraction, as they engage with interpreted accounts rather than lived experiences, a limitation that, within decolonial research, risks re-silencing GSIP students' voices (Tuhiwai Smith, 2022). The focus on recent UK qualitative studies provides depth but excludes some emerging research on AI and academic integrity, in a rapidly evolving field.

The DAF, while effective, remains a pilot framework and therefore carries the risk of deficit readings of scholarship and thematic overlap. For instance, discussions of

surveillance and agency occasionally intersect, making it difficult to isolate one analytical dimension without diminishing the complexity of power relations. Finally, the study remains situated within the Eurocentric academic structure and Enlightenment legacies it critiques (Guhin and Wyrtzen, 2013).

## **Conclusion**

This dissertation's methodology establishes a critical and decolonial foundation for analysing how GSIP students perceive and experience academic integrity in UK HE, as well as how students are represented in scholarship and policy. By employing a critical literature review framed through a dual theoretical lens, the study foregrounds the power relations that shape knowledge production. Reflexive engagement, ethical sensitivity, and acknowledgement of limitations ensure transparency and credibility (Creswell, 2013)

Although constrained by its reliance on secondary sources and by operating within the Eurocentric academic structures and, Enlightenment legacies it critiques, this methodology provides a coherent platform for piloting the DAF in the following analysis chapter.

## **5. ANALYSIS**

### **Analysis Introduction**

This chapter applies the DAF to interrogate both the lived experiences of GSIP students and how they are constructed within UK academic integrity scholarship and

institutional governance. The analysis has two levels: the empirical findings and research designs of the UK studies (UK Corpus), and three university academic integrity policies. Organised thematically around deficit discourse, epistemic dominance, institutional power, identity, and voice and agency, the chapter maps how GSIP students are often framed as deficient, deviant, or homogenised, while their agency and epistemic authority can be muted.

## **Part 1: Literature**

### **Introduction**

This section critically analyses the UK Corpus using the Decolonial Analytical Framework (DAF); read through a dual lens: diachronically (PCT) and synchronically (CRT) and organised through the five themes. Each theme interrogates both what the research finds about GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity and how these findings are produced through methodological design and narrative framing.

This dual focus structure ensures that interpretation and methodology are analysed together, showing how colonial hierarchies of knowledge persist within the assumed neutrality of both institutional and research practices. By comparing focal pairs (two of the UK Corpus purposively selected to comparatively analyse), wider UK papers and GN studies, the analysis demonstrates how academic integrity research both challenges and perpetuates colonial and racialised epistemic assumptions. In doing so, it evaluates whether GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity are

represented as complex, differentiated, and agentic, or constrained within homogenising and racialised frameworks.

## **Theme 1: Deficit Discourse.**

### **Literature Findings**

The findings indicate that GSIP students are often positioned through deficit and cultural pathology discourses, focusing on students' deficiencies and problems, aligning with the first DAF theme.

Owusu-Kwarteng (2021, p. 2413) finds West African GSIP student participants experience racialised microaggressions, such as a lecturer assuming that intentional plagiarism was 'more likely amongst us', consistent with Valencia's (2010) deficit thinking model. Lomer and Mittelmeier (2023) argue that deficit discourse remains common in UK scholarship. Gao (2025, p. 7) documents an 'ideology of incompetence' that links academic English proficiency with intellectual and moral worth, echoing Said's (2003, p. 12) PCT theory of Othering.

Rather than supporting diverse epistemologies, pedagogical feedback and institutional processes pathologise diversity as deficiency. Zhuang and Bell (2024, p. 630) and Strachan, Oguna and Oruche (2024, p. 4) highlight how GSIP participants felt undervalued and disrespected, despite paying higher tuition fees than domestic peers. McKenna (2022) and Andreotti (2011) interpret this as exploitation of GSIP students within the commodification of internationalised GN HE. Davis (2022, p. 9) records one participant saying , 'I have a lack of knowledge about plagiarism, as an international

student, I still need to learn how to write an essay properly...I should know but I don't, it's very bad', exemplifying Valencia's (2010, p. 3) claim that deficit thinking blames the victim. Jindal-Snape (2023) similarly critiques a trend in GN research that positions GSIP students as needing to acculturate rather than examining institutional conditions. Evidence of resistance also emerges; GSIP students in Holliman *et al.* (2023) and Gao (2025) challenge low academic expectations and deficit narratives, although these acts of agency remain marginal to dominant deficit framings.

The findings show that GSIP students are confined within racialised deficit narratives that can become internalised and institutionally reproduced, compounding inequity.

### **Research Design**

The focal pair for this theme are Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku (2024) and Holliman *et al.* (2023).

Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku (2024) aim to challenge cultural determinism, by rejecting assumptions that GSIP students are predisposed to intentional academic misconduct and caution staff against reductive stereotyping, an important contribution that resists the cultural pathologisation dominating GN research (Valencia, 2010; Andreotti, 2011).

However, the study's methodology simultaneously limits this contribution. Reliance on a closed-question survey, convenience sampling, and six unrecorded interviews restricts student testimony to pre-defined deficit categories, such as 'weak educational background' and 'lack of self-confidence' (Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku, 2024, p. 8). As Ramjattan, (2023) argues, surveys framed through deficit confine GSIP student

experiences within assumptions of inadequacy. Reliance on researcher notes rather than recordings further compromises transparency and risks interpretative bias (Rutakumwa *et al.*, 2020; Coleman, 2022).

Ontologically, Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku (2024) treat fear and low confidence as innate traits without interrogating the institutional environment that contributes to them; diachronically, what Tuhiwai Smith (2022, p. 49) terms ‘research through imperial eyes’. As such, the study resists one form of determinism, cultural essentialism, only to reinscribe another ,psychological deficit, leaving Eurocentric academic standards unchallenged, a pattern mirrored in wider GN studies (Birks *et al.*, 2020; Cutri *et al.*, 2021).

By contrast, Holliman *et al.* (2023) adopt purposive sampling and bilingual interviews in English and Mandarin, resisting monolingual dominance by validating GSIP student agency and enabling participants to articulate their experiences in their first language (Fay *et al.*, 2023). The study attributes students’ ‘silence’ and ‘struggle’ to teaching environments, rather than cultural or individual deficiency, resisting deficit discourse.

However, by framing participants’ challenges as evidence of the ‘acculturation required’ of Chinese GSIP students, Holliman *et al.* (2023, p. 14) risk recentring deficit discourse through assimilation frames, Heng and Lu (2023) . The absence of explicit researcher positionality compounds this risk; without reflexive engagement, claims of inclusive practice remain partial (Adriansen and Spangler, 2023). Comparatively within the UK Corpus, Gao (2025) and Owusu-Kwarteng (2021) explicitly locate researcher positionality to expose racialised power structures.

Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku (2024) and Holliman *et al.* (2023) illustrate the methodological tension that sustains deficit discourses; both seek to resist pathologising GSIP students but operate within uncritiqued Eurocentric frameworks that reproduce Othering, a trend common amongst GN literature (Bamberger, 2022; Tang T. Heng and Lu, 2023; Tavares, 2024).

### **Synthesis**

Across the UK Corpus, deficit discourses appear not only as findings but as a methodological pattern. GSIP students are often constructed as deficient learners who must adapt to hegemonic academic culture. These framings turn systemic and epistemic inequities into personal failings. Research methods that rely on narrow survey questions or uncritical cultural comparisons reproduce these discourses, presenting difference as deficit. Through the DAF, deficit discourse is understood as both epistemic and affective; it defines whose knowledge counts and can regulate GSIP students through internalised deficiencies.

## **Theme 2: Epistemic Dominance**

### **Literature Findings**

The findings indicate that GSIP students frequently experience epistemic domination, in which UK academic integrity conventions are naturalised as neutral universal standards.

Chowdhury, Rahman and McCray (2023, p. 31) identify friction between British and Asian academic integrity norms, including referencing and critical argumentation, which negatively affects GSIP students' wellbeing, belonging and academic self-confidence. Strachan, Oguna and Oruche (2024, p. 4) show that practices regarded as acceptable in GSIP students' home countries can be punished as academic misconduct in the UK. Academic misconduct procedures intensify this stress (Owusu-Kwarteng, 2021; Davis, 2022; Holliman *et al.*, 2023; Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku, 2024). These findings align diachronically with Spivak's (1988) concept of epistemic violence, where diverse epistemologies are silenced by being judged as illegitimate.

Academic English emerges as a key site of dominance. Zhuang and Bell (2024, p. 631) report GSIP students experiencing tension between the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) and the expected institutional standard of UK academic English. Gao (2025, p. 5) documents an 'ideology of English-only' that marginalises students' linguistic diversity. Synchronously, these patterns reflect Harris's (1993) concept of whiteness as property, where academic English proficiency grants legitimacy and privileged. Okello (2023, p. 115) terms this process as, 'epistemic asphyxiation'.

GS pedagogies are also devalued. Owusu-Kwarteng (2021) and Astley (2024) show how GSIP students experiences stress when memorisation and exam based traditions of students' home countries are judged inferior to UK dialectic pedagogy of critical argumentation. These findings echo Zembylas (2025) concept of affective injustice, where stress and alienation result from systemic epistemic hierarchies and enforced

academic conformity, found across GN studies (Birks *et al.*, 2020; Cutri *et al.*, 2021; Tran, Hogg and Marshall, 2022).

These findings reveal epistemic dominance as the diachronic continuation of colonial hierarchies of knowledge (Spivak, 1988), and synchronically as the reproduction of whiteness as property (Harris, 1993). The DAF clarifies how UK linguistic and epistemic norms operate as racialised gatekeepers to legitimacy.

### **Research Design**

The focal pair for this theme are Chowdhury, Rahman and McCray (2023) and Sbaffi and Zhao (2022).

Chowdhury, Rahman and McCray (2023, p. 21) map the ‘difficulties’ GSIP students’ face with academic integrity literacies, linking these with performance and belonging. Their contribution lies in identifying friction points between Asian and UK norms, what Oyinloye and Zhang (2023, p. 220, p. 220) describe as ‘border thinking’: pinch points where structural inequity becomes most visible.

However, this strength is undermined by unexamined epistemological assumptions. ‘Academic literacies’ (Chowdhury, Rahman and McCray, 2024, p. 26) are equated with UK academic integrity norms without definition, while ‘criticality’ and ‘argument’ are positioned as universal competencies. This reproduces Spivak’s (1988) epistemic violence, translating epistemological difference into difficulties. The study also exemplifies Unkule’s (2023, p. 149) ‘methodological nationalism’, treating local conventions as global standards. Within the DAF, this exposes how research

methodology can become a site of diachronic coloniality: the lens of analysis reproduces the hierarchy it seeks to describe.

Sbaffi and Zhao (2022) design and evaluate an online academic integrity induction module, measured by pre/post testing and analytics. Their pragmatic intervention recognises that opacity is structural rather than individual, aligning with Unkule (2023) who argues for reconfiguring institutional practices rather than focusing on changing GSI students.

However, the epistemic framing undermines this strength. Academic integrity is defined through Enlightenment derived moral codes of honesty and virtue (Sbaffi and Zhao, 2022, p. 2), which, synchronically, Pham (2023) argues, code academic legitimacy as White cultural property. Visuals in the module reinforce Eurocentric whiteness as normative (Moosavi, 2022), while the absence of reflexivity entrenches this assumed neutrality (Hutcheson, 2023).

Across the UK corpus, similar patterns recur. Studies rarely define their key concepts implicitly treating UK academic norms as universal (Owusu-Kwarteng, 2021; Davis, 2022; Holliman *et al.*, 2023; Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku, 2024; Zhuang and Bell, 2024; Gao, 2025). Even where alternative epistemic frameworks are noted, such as in Astley (2024), Indian epistemic traditions are framed through deficiency rather than parity. Wider GN studies mirror this hierarchical pattern (Birks *et al.*, 2020; Cutri *et al.*, 2021; Parnther, 2022).

Together, this focal pair studies demonstrate how both research design and inventions can reassert the dominance the studies aim to challenge (Stoesz and Eaton, 2022) .

## **Synthesis**

Academic integrity is frequently defined through Eurocentric norms assumed to be universal. GSIP students' epistemic and linguistic diversities are then framed as weaknesses or confusion. In this way epistemic dominance operates both in students lived experiences, through exclusion and illegitimacy, and within the methodologies that evaluate them. Studies often treat UK academic practices as culturally neutral when in fact they are, as argued by Rizvi (2022) and Bennett *et al.* (2023), locally specific expressions of whiteness and privilege. The DAF reveals that these methodological choices reproduce epistemic hierarchies, diachronically, and sustain whiteness as property synchronically.

## **Theme 3: Institutional Power**

### **Literature Findings**

Findings show that GSIP students often experience academic integrity policy, pedagogy, and procedures as more punitive governance than supportive pedagogy.

Owusu-Kwarteng (2021, p. 2413) reports West African GSIP students having to defend the authenticity of their work due to staff assumptions of plagiarism. Davis (2022, p. 7) records students experiencing academic misconduct processes as accusatory, while Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku, (2024, p. 8) find students' fear and anxiety heightened by opaque rules and inaccessible information. Collectively, these findings synchronically

exemplify Delgado and Stefancic's (2023) CRT concept of racialised deviance and criminality, where GSIP students are framed as presumed offenders. Diachronically, Brown (2023) and Crichlow (2023) link such power dynamics to colonial penal logics, while Kidd, Battaly and Cassam (2021, p. 10) describe the shift from pedagogy to policing as 'epistemic vice'.

Policy opacity compounds inequity. Davis (2022) identifies institutional documents as inaccessible and legalistic; Sbaffi and Zhao (2022) describe academic integrity induction modules as mistimed, one-off and compliance focused; Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku (2024) note confusion around definitions and terminology; and Strachan, Oguna and Oruche (2024) record sanctions imposed without guidance. These findings reflect Quijano's (2000) PCT concept of the coloniality of power, where restricted access to essential knowledge sustains institutional dominance.

Wider GN studies show similar patterns. Birks *et al.* (2020), Cutri *et al.* (2021), and Tran, Hogg and Marshall (2022) find surveillance cultures shaping GSIP students' experiences in Australia and New Zealand. Bannister, Peñalver and Urbieta (2024) highlight that algorithmic plagiarism detection software disproportionately misclassifies GSI students' work as academic misconduct.

Read through the DAF, these findings reveal the diachronic continuity between colonial systems of discipline and modern academic governance, and synchronically the racialised production of compliance through criminalisation.

## **Research Design**

The focal pair for this theme are Davis (2022) and Strachan, Oguna and Oruche (2024).

Davis (2022) provides one of the few UK Corpus studies explicitly interrogating academic integrity policies as mechanisms of governance rather than neutral tools. Examining documentation alongside staff and student interviews, Davis (2022) exposes the punitive tone, legalistic framing and systemic opacity of academic integrity procedures. This aligns with the DAF's focus on institutional power; opacity in bureaucratic discourse, diachronically echoes Quijano's (2000) argument that inaccessibility sustains hierarchies of control.

Methodologically, the study demonstrates ethical sensitivity by only interviewing GSIP students who had completed misconduct processes and accepted academic writing support, thus avoiding the exploitation of vulnerability (Beck, 2023). However, the study lacks explicit theoretical framing and reflexivity, thereby limiting its critique of power (Oyinloye and Zhang, 2023). Student testimony is presented through extended quotations, yet is structurally subordinated: descriptions of judgemental treatment are immediately counterbalanced by staff reassurances (Davis, 2022, p. 7). This illustrates Udah's (2023) critique that GN research, can reproduce the asymmetries of the power it critiques, granting institutional voices greater credibility than GSI student accounts.

Strachan, Oguna and Oruche (2024) complement Davis (2022) by foregrounding GSIP students' perspective on academic integrity in relation to essay mills and AI. Their innovation, using GSIP students as facilitators, reflects Dollinger, Gupta and Nguyen's (2023) call to for participatory design, and partially redistributes epistemic authority.

However, contradictions persist. Although described as ‘exploratory’ with ‘no clear outcomes’ (Strachan, Oguna and Oruche, 2024, p. 3), the study still produces six recommendations for institutional action, consequently framed as optional. The authors also describe student honesty as a methodological limitation, implying distrust of participant testimony rather than analysing structural factors such as fear, surveillance and visa precarity. Synchronously, this exemplifies testimonial injustice (Kidd, Battaly and Cassam, 2021), where the credibility of marginalised voices is diminished.

Across the UK Corpus, similar patterns endure. While Gao (2025) and Owusu-Kwarteng (2021) show reflexively, most omit positionality, sustaining the fiction of neutrality (Sbaffi and Zhao, 2022; Holliman *et al.*, 2023; Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku, 2024; Astley, 2024; Chowdhury, Rahman and McCray, 2024; Zhuang and Bell, 2024). Linguistic choices such as ‘commit’, ‘cheat’, ‘breach’ and ‘offence’ function as mechanisms of criminalisation that synchronically construct GSIP students as deviant, Delgado and Stefancic, 2023). This pattern is mirrored in wider GN studies (Birks *et al.*, 2020; Cutri *et al.*, 2021; Parnther, 2022; Tran, Hogg and Marshall, 2022).

Read together, the two focal studies illuminate the potential and limitations of UK research that engages with GSIP students and institutional power.

## **Synthesis**

For GSIP students, academic integrity procedures are experienced as disciplinary and opaque rather than developmental or transparent. Legalistic and criminalistic framings cast GSIP students as deviant or untrustworthy, producing fear and exclusion instead

of academic belonging. Within the DAF, both diachronically and synchronically institutional power emerges as the controller of academic integrity discourse and lived experience whilst research methodologies and narrative can sustain GSIP students as subjects of surveillance.

## **Theme 4: Identity**

### **Literature Findings**

The findings reveal that GSIP students' academic integrity experiences can be shaped by intersecting inequities.

Holliman *et al.* (2023), , Strachan, Ogunu and Oruche (2024) and Zhuang and Bell (2024) highlight the compounded effects of racism, visa precarity, financial pressures, caring responsibilities, accommodation insecurity, and language barriers. These multiple sites of oppression, synchronically illustrate Crenshaw's (1991) intersectionality, where overlapping axes of disadvantage intensify marginalisation . Dickson, Bradley and Read (2024) further show that GSIP students who are parents face gendered pressures affecting engagement with learning and integrity practices.

Homogenising discourses also persist. Gao (2025, p.7) finds that Chinese GSIP students experience racialised essentialist narratives, aligning with PCT's diachronic critiques of essentialism (Spivak, 1999; Andreotti, 2011) and CRT's synchronic analysis of racial stereotyping (Delgado and Stefancic, 2023). Denisova-Schmidt (2024) and Moosavi (2022) also find GSI students' identities homogenised, erasing diversity.

Wider GN studies confirm this tendency: Tran, Hogg and Marshall (2022, p. 17) find that Vietnamese GSIP students' experiences vary with individual educational background, while Buckner *et al.* (2021) show that internationalisation rhetoric celebrates diversity but erases race, exemplifying CRT's critique of liberalism (Delgado and Stefancic, 2023).

Through the DAF, these findings highlight the contradiction between GSIP students' lived intersectional realities and the essentialist institutional framings that persist within UK HE. Diachronically, this reproduces Enlightenment taxonomies of classification (Hall, 1995); synchronically, it conceals the uneven distribution of inequity by homogenising diversity.

## **Research Design**

The focal pair for this theme are Owusu-Kwarteng (2021) and Astley (2024).

Owusu-Kwarteng's (2021) offers one of the most reflexive studies in the UK Corpus, analysing West African GSIP students' experiences of racialised suspicion and low academic expectations. Its strength lies in resisting homogenisation; participants are disaggregated by nationality, age and sex, challenging the generic 'international student' label that as Soorenian (2023) argues, flattens identity. Reflexivity strengthens the study; Owusu-Kwarteng (2021, p. 2406) situates themself as a Black British researcher of Ghanaian heritage, countering the absent positionality typical in the field. Diachronically, this resists colonial homogenisation by recognising differentiated identities and epistemologies (Spivak, 1988).

However, the study does not fully realise intersectionality. Demographic categories are treated descriptively rather than as intersecting constructs of oppression. From a CRT perspective, this omission weakens the analysis. Crenshaw (1991) and Dickson, Bradley and Read (2024) emphasise how the intersections of race and gender shape specific experiences for Black women; however, these interactions remain unexamined. The chosen theoretical frameworks compound this limitation; reliance on push–pull and structuration models risks reductionism (Khoo, 2021, p. 705; Ploner, 2023), simplifying GSIP students' experiences and omitting colonial and feminist critique. Nonetheless, foregrounding racism as embedded in GSIP students' academic life, marks a significant advance (Hutcheson, 2023).

Astley (2024) also avoids homogenisation by focusing on Indian GSIP students, aligning with decolonial calls to move beyond generic framings (Buckner *et al.*, 2021; Denisova-Schmidt, 2024). The recommendation that lecturers adopt cultural humility and learn about Indian academic traditions signals recognition of epistemic plurality and gestures towards disrupting Enlightenment universalism (Oyinloye and Zhang, 2023).

However, these strengths are undermined by heavy reliance on Hofstede's (2010) cultural dimensions model. As Biswas (2023) argues, Hofstede enacts epistemic violence by reducing identity to colonial typologies. Fougère and Moulettes (2007, p. 1) show how Hofstede's 'modern West / backward Rest' binary reinstates colonial hierarchies that the study reproduces. Astley's (2024, p. 973) likening of Indian GSIP students sense of dislocation to an 'infant state' and use of the phrase 'cannibals in some cultures' (Astley, 2024, p. 975) as a comparative examples of cultural differences

reflects a colonial gaze; exemplifying dehumanising Eurocentrism (Hall, 1995). In CRT terms, this racialised framing reinforces essentialist identity fixing racial hierarchy as natural (Carbado and Harris, 2019).

Across the UK Corpus, homogenisation dominates. Davis, (2022), Sbaffi and Zhao (2022), and Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku (2024) use undifferentiated ‘international students’ categories; Strachan, Oguna and Oruche (2024) list participant nationalities but do not disaggregate; Chowdhury, Rahman and McCray (2024) homogenise Asian students; and Holliman *et al.* (2023), Zhuang and Bell (2024) and Gao (2025) research Chinese students without intersectional analysis. Mittelmeier *et al.* (2023) identify the reliance on categorising GSIP students through only nationality and visa status as a dominant pattern in GN scholarship that obscures heterogeneity and erases intersectionality. Wider GN studies replicate this (Birks *et al.*, 2020; Cutri *et al.*, 2021; Parnther, 2022).

Together, the focal pair of studies illustrate contrasting elements of the Identity theme. Owusu-Kwarteng (2021) disaggregates and reflexively situates the researcher yet leaves intersectionality underdeveloped; Astley (2024), gestures toward epistemic plurality yet reproduces racial hierarchies through theoretical dependence on Hofstede (2010). Diachronically, both reveal how Enlightenment typologies endure within contemporary methodology; synchronically, they show how intersectionality can be invoked rhetorically but applied superficially, flattening the complexity of GSIP students’ experiences.

## **Synthesis**

Across the literature, GSIP students are frequently represented as a homogeneous group, with complex intersections of race, gender, and visa precarity largely ignored. Such categories conceal the differentiated and intersectional realities of GSIP student life. Through the DAF, homogenisation is revealed as both an epistemic and methodological problem; it shapes how students are perceived and experience academic integrity and how research itself defines diversity.

## **Theme 5: Voice and Agency**

### **Literature Findings**

The findings show how GSIP students navigate both silencing and resistance.

Some studies highlight GSIP student resistance. Owusu-Kwarteng (2021, p. 2412) finds West African GSIP students challenging assumptive teaching practices, while Strachan, Oguna and Oruche (2024, p. 5) highlight GSIP students confronting inadequate academic integrity pedagogy. Comparatively, Mahmud (2024) finds that Muslim doctoral GSIP students use counter-storytelling to resist Islamophobia, exemplifying, Solórzano and Yosso's (2002), concept of counter-narrative as epistemic resistance.

Silence, however, is often misread as deficiency. Holliman *et al.*, (2023, pp. 8, 13) report Chinese GSIP students' quietness is interpreted by staff as lack of ability rather than fear of hypervisibility or linguistic error. Chowdhury, Rahman and McCray (2023, p. 29) show that some Asian GSIP students perceive dialogical feedback as threatening, thus remaining silent. Diachronically, these findings echo Spivak's (1988) PCT's theory

of subaltern silencing and Fanon's (2021) reading of silence as survival. Institutional practices reinforce this; Gao (2025, p. 5) documents exclusionary actions such as banning Mandarin in classrooms and supervisory intimidation, one participant pursued a grievance 'despite deep fear'. Synchronically, Lootens and Fúnez-Flores (2024) similarly show how racialised doctoral students create counter-safe spaces as resistance.

Some recognition occurs. Zhuang and Bell (2024, p. 629, 633) find that differentiated pedagogy fosters inclusion; Astley (2024, p. 977) shows Indian GSIP students negotiating between epistemic traditions. Nonetheless, structural silencing persists. Sbaffi and Zhao (2022, p. 10) expose punitive and domineering institutional communication, and Davis (2022, p. 7) reports a GSIP student feeling 'scared, alone and voiceless' during the academic misconduct process.

Wider GN studies echo these patterns. Bannister, Peñalver and Urbieto (2024) reveal GSIP students' absence from 131 academic integrity policies and Parnther (2022), translates lived experiences through Hofstede's (2010) cultural dimensions, muting individuality and criticality.

These findings expose the tension between regulation and resistance, diachronically as legacies of colonial silencing, and synchronically as constrained counter storytelling.

## **Methodologies and Narratives**

The focal pair for this theme are Zhuang and Bell (2024) and Gao (2025).

Zhuang and Bell (2024, p. 626) claim a ‘decolonising approach’, resisting deficit framings of Chinese GSIP students and foregrounding participants’ perspectives. Their strength lies in conducting focus groups and bilingual analysis, resisting monolingual dominance and preserving linguistic nuance Fay *et al.*’s (2023). Extensive quotations from GSIP students describe experiences of racism, linguistic barriers and punitive treatment, correlating with decolonial praxis that centres students’ voices and institutional accountability (Montgomery, 2023; Nada, 2023).

However, the absence of a clear research question or detailed methodology risks reducing findings to description; a limitation Lomer and Mittelmeier (2023) identify across GN research. Reflexivity is limited; while the first author notes their background as a former Chinese GSIP student, Zhuang and Bell (2024, p. 628) do not explore insider/outside dynamics, weakening claims to a decolonial approach (Adriansen and Spangler, 2023). Diachronically, this reflects Tuhiwai Smith’s (2022) warning that, without transparent positionality even inclusive research risks extractive testimony. Moosavi (2020, 2022) critiques similar performative decoloniality without embedding meaningful praxis.

By contrast, Gao (2025) offers one of the strongest examples of decolonial praxis in the UK Corpus. The study explicitly names racial structures as ‘historical multi-scalar and globally linked to the production of supremacy’ (Gao, 2025, p. 2), embedding CRT in ways rarely seen in GN academia (Workman, 2024). Methodologically, combining Mandarin semi-structured interviews with participant diaries enacts counter-storytelling, amplifying narrative agency and validating students’ epistemic authority (Solórzano and Yosso, 2002). Narrative analysis situates raciolinguistic exclusion and

supervisory intimidation within structural racism, rather than individual failings (Temple, 2008). Gao (2025) moves beyond descriptive diagnosis to recommend further research on race and language and calls for GSIP student agency as a force for institutional change (Montgomery, 2023).

However, gender remains unexamined, overlooking compounded inequities that intersectional analysis could illuminate (Crenshaw, 1991; Carbado and Harris, 2019; Dickson, Bradley and Read, 2024). Synchronically, this narrows the counter-storytelling potential and risks flattening the study's decolonial scope (Glass, Heng and Hou, 2022).

Across the UK Corpus, GSIP student voices are often invited but rarely authorised. Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku (2024) reduce testimony to pre-coded deficit categories; Sbaffi and Zhao (2022) relegate GSIP student voices to compliance modules; Davis (2022) amplifies quotations but subordinates them to institutional voices. Wider GN studies show similar patterns: Birks *et al.* (2020) collect only staff perspectives while Bannister, Peñalver and Urbieta (2024) highlight institutionalised silencing through omission.

Diachronically, PCT clarifies how colonial governance historically demanded that GS voices acculturate to Eurocentric discourse for legitimisation. This is evident in Zhuang and Bell's (2024) reversion to Eurocentric analysis, and in wider studies showing how GSIP students must still navigate institutional silencing (Lootens and Fúnez-Flores, 2024; Memon and Jivraj, 2024). Synchronically, CRT highlights how counter-storytelling disrupts this silencing. Gao (2025) exemplifies this, with participant diaries

functioning as counter-stories that expose institutional whiteness and racism. Other scholars advocate for similar decolonial methodologies (Dutta, Azad and Hussain, 2022; Bedford and Shaffer, 2023; Mahmud, 2024; Torres *et al.*, 2025)

Together, the focal pair Zhuang and Bell (2024) and Gao (2025) illustrate multiple dimensions of the Voice and Agency theme. The former amplifies GSIP student voices without redistributing power; the later realises genuine counter-storytelling positioning GSIP students as epistemic agents of structural and institutional critique (Gao, 2025). In DAF terms, they diachronically reveal how academic integrity research methodologies and narratives continue to reproduce Spivak's (1988, p. 24) subaltern silencing, whilst synchronically counter-narratives disrupt but remain marginal.

## Synthesis

GSIP students' voices are invited but epistemic authority remains centralised within the institution or researcher. Even inclusive studies can reproduce silencing when they collect narratives without redistributing epistemic power. The DAF exposes this tension between tokenistic inclusion and genuine agency. Diachronically, silencing persists as a colonial legacy; synchronically, it reappears in research that listens without sharing authority. Methodologies that enable counter-storytelling, where students shape meaning on their own terms, move toward epistemic justice by transforming voice from data into authorship.

## Conclusion

This integrated analysis reveals a consistent pattern across the five DAF themes: GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of UK academic integrity are structured by epistemic, institutional and affective asymmetries that act as barriers to equitable learning experiences. Diachronically, the analysis exposes the endurance of Othering, disciplinary governance, homogenisation and silencing inherited from Enlightenment rationalities and imperial categorisations. Synchronously, these legacies are reproduced through contemporary research and discourse that constrains academic agency through racialised suspicion.

Some studies offer decolonial advances. Multilingual interviewing (Holliman *et al.*, 2023), reflexive positionality (Owusu-Kwarteng, 2021) and explicit CRT framing (Gao, 2025) represent steps toward redistributing epistemic authority. However, these examples remain exceptions rather than norms: the field largely reproduces the colonial logics it seeks to critiques, with GSIP students represented as deficient, voiceless, or suspect.

The next section examines whether institutional academic integrity policies also encode coloniality and racialisation.

## **Part 2: Policies**

### **Introduction**

This section analyses three anonymised UK university academic integrity policies (Policy A, Policy B, Policy C). As with the literature review, the DAF is applied thematically, each of its five themes are assessed diachronically through PCT and synchronic through CRT situating policy analysis within both colonial legacies and reproduction of racialised inequities in the present. The analysis also incorporates wider policy scholarship, highlighting both strengths and omissions. It identifies whether, and how, these policies may impact GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity within UK universities.

### **Theme 1: Deficit Discourse**

Deficit framings are evident, across all three policies, though they take a different form in each one.

Policy A (Anonymised Institution A, 2025, p. 11 ) makes a progressive move by distinguishing 'poor academic practice' from 'academic misconduct' and by offering academic integrity support to students. However, the policy presumes automatic understanding of academic integrity, positioning failure as a deficiency rather than as the result of opaque and complex rules. Valencia and Solorzano's (2012) concept of victim blaming and Moosavi's (2022) critique of individualised psychology both apply here, as does Shore and Wright's (2011) argument that policy can render students hyper-visible as potential violators while obscuring institutional responsibility.

Policy B (Anonymised Institution B, 2025) arguably achieves accessibility through brevity; a strength noted by Stoesz and Eaton (2022) as supporting GSI students. However, the policy assumes all students can equally navigate regulations, erasing potential language barriers and diverse academic integrity procedures. Perkins and Roe (2024) show how policies framed through compliance discourse can position students as problems rather than as co-producers of knowledge.

Policy C (Anonymised Institution C, 2024, p. 3) foregrounds staff responsibility, shifting some accountability towards the institution. However, all students are again assumed to be equal members of the academic community and as such are expected to equally develop academic integrity skills. This assumption arguably reinscribes deficit thinking; learning experiences of academic integrity are not equal for GSIP students and, as Mejía and Garcés-Flórez (2025) argue, equitable practice for GSIP students requires visible differentiation and co-construction.

Diachronically, the deficit discourses in the policies reflects Othering (Said, 2003; Andreotti, 2011). Synchronically, this deficit thinking model persists, attributing failure solely to students (Valencia, 2010; Lomer, Taha and Hayes, 2023).

## **Theme 2: Epistemic Dominance**

All three policies reproduce epistemic dominance by assuming UK academic integrity norms are universal standards.

Policy A (Anonymised Institution A, 2025a, p. 11-13) provides structured categorisation of different forms of academic misconduct. However, the practice of academic integrity, such as referencing, is defined solely through breaches like plagiarism, while the only definition of academic integrity is abstract, moralistic, and Enlightenment inspired, ‘being honest and sticking to morals that most people would agree with, such as telling the truth.’ (Anonymised Institution A, 2025, p. 10). By treating Eurocentric ideals of originality and authorship as natural and legitimate, this sustains whiteness as property (Harris, 1993). Ploner and Nada (2020b) document similar exclusionary epistemic hierarchies in Portugal and the UK, while Shore and Wright (2011) argue that policy produces truths through selective visibility, making diverse epistemologies and academic cultures appear illegitimate.

Policy B (Anonymised Institution B, 2025) frames academic integrity as compliance and fails to define the concept. Perkins and Roe (2024) highlight how such approaches restrict academic integrity as hegemonic governance only, rendering diverse academic traditions invisible and subordinated.

Policy C (Anonymised Institution C, 2024) gestures towards epistemic justice by including some institutional accountability. However, placing this accountability only within induction modules still presumes Eurocentric academic literacy as the epistemic baseline. Stoesz and Eaton (2022) contend that such curtailed inclusivity masks Eurocentrism and leaves the structural hierarchy intact.

Diachronically, these policies appear to replicate colonial knowledge hierarchies through assumed Eurocentric knowledge (Tuhiwai Smith, 2022; Sikka and Proctor,

2024; Zembylas, 2025). Synchronously, they appear to enact whiteness as property, monopolising academic legitimacy and epistemology through Eurocentric governance.

### **Theme 3: Institutional Power**

The three policies position academic integrity as a mechanism of surveillance and discipline.

Policy A (Anonymised Institution A, 2025) offers detailed procedures, promoting transparency. However, the language is legalistic; ‘offences’ and ‘penalties’ (Anonymised Institution A, 2025, pp. 11–15) construe academic misconduct as criminality, aligning with Delgado and Stefancic's (2023) critique of deviance framing. Bureaucratic density mirrors Quijano's (2000) concept of the coloniality of power, wherein governance relies on opacity. Shore and Wright (2011) argue that policy operates as a technology of governance; applied to this context, juridical categorisation disciplines students while shielding the institution from responsibility.

Policy B (Anonymised Institution B, 2025b, p. 4) omits the possibility of unintentional academic misconduct by imposing penalties without due regard to intentionality. This constricts space for diverse prior academic cultures, echoing Okello's (2023) epistemic asphyxiation. Kidd, Battaly and Cassam (2021) contend that such dynamics are examples of epistemic vice and injustice, whereby institutional authority, while appearing neutral, holds absolute power.

Policy C (Anonymised Institution C, 2024, p. 9) adopts a more inclusive approach by using flow charts to illustrate academic misconduct procedures. Soorenian (2023)

argues that, when communicating with GSI students, presenting information in diverse formats supports transparency and fosters accessibility. However, the language remains judicial in tone; sustained use of words such as ‘commit’ and ‘beyond reasonable doubt’ (Anonymised Institution C, 2024, p. 8) reproduce the punitive power of the institution (Crichlow, 2023).

Diachronically, these policies appear to perpetuate colonial judicial governance rooted in racialised Enlightenment categorisations of honesty and intentionality (Tuhiwai Smith, 2022; Yin, 2024). Synchronically, they enact criminalisation, casting students as dishonest offenders while legitimising institutional surveillance and authority (Chadderton, 2013; Brown, 2023; Cabrera *et al.*, 2024).

#### **Theme 4: Identity**

All three policies homogenise student identity by almost entirely failing to recognise differentiated or intersectional experiences.

Policy A (Anonymised Institution A, 2025 )refers generically to ‘students’, failing to recognise unequitable student learning experiences. That said, it is the only policy of the three to specifically mention ‘international students’ (Anonymised Institution, 2025a, p. 19). However, this reference instructs staff to inform the International Team if a GSI student has been accused of academic misconduct, as any resulting penalty may impact visa status. This aligns with Glass, Heng and Hou's (2022) argument that GSI students experience unequal power differentials within UK university governance.

Policy B (Anonymised Institution B, 2025) erases any diversity by assuming that all students experience academic integrity equally. This homogenisation, aligns with Shore and Wright's (2011) contention that policy classifies by administrative order, here, complex identities are omitted for administrative ease.

Policy C (Anonymised Institution C, 2024, p. 25), omits reference to 'international students', though it mentions 'international partnership students', only to allocate institutional responsibility for reporting and investigating alleged offences. This focus on governance rather than differentiated experience aligns with Lee and Mao's (2025) argument that GN institutions retain power to define GSI student identity.

Diachronically, the homogenised category of 'student' delegitimises GSI students' complex identities and experiences within the post-colonial internationalised UK HE system (Bhabha, 2012; Moosavi, 2022; Denisova-Schmidt, 2024). Synchronically, CRT reveals how the absence of intersectionality can whitewash policy and obscure compounded inequities (Crenshaw, 2018; Carbado and Harris, 2019). This also aligns with Bannister, Peñalver and Urbietas (2024) findings that GSI students scarcely appear in GN policy despite the well documented risk of plagiarism detection software bias which disproportionality and incorrectly flags GSI students' work as academic misconduct.

### **Theme 5: Voice and Agency**

All three policies largely silence students by positioning them as subjects of compliance and regulation, rather than agents of knowledge production.

Policy A (Anonymised Institution A, 2025a, p. 7) gives students accused of academic misconduct the opportunity to provide a written statement and attend an interview, which formally safeguards their rights. However, student voice is admitted only as a defence against accusation within unacknowledged, and uneven power dynamics. This exemplifies Spivak's (1988) subaltern silencing. Shore and Wright (2011) argue that policy dictates whose voices are heard; in this instance, institutions speak authoritatively, students defensively.

Policy B (Anonymised Institution B, 2025b, p. 7) provides more space for student voice; when contesting an 'allegation', students must 'present their case in person'. However, student voice remains restricted within a judicial environment. As Perkins and Roe (2024) argue, such governance based approaches privilege institutional authority, limiting opportunities for equitable participatory engagement.

Policy C (Anonymised Institution C, 2024, p. 10), echoes the other two policies, by detailing how students accused of academic misconduct are advised in writing by the institution only after concerns have been verified and a penalty proposed. Students can bring a 'friend or adviser' to a hearing conducted in English, but 'they will not be able to speak on the student's behalf' (Anonymised Institution C, 2024, p. 11). This constriction of student voice and silencing of linguistic diversity arguably aligns with Solórzano and Yosso's (2002, p. 28) concept of the 'majoritarian story', which distorts and marginalises the experiences of racially minoritised individuals.

Diachronically, these policies can appear to reproduce colonial legacies of silencing, wherein the Eurocentric institutional voice dominates (Spivak, 1988; Tuhiwai Smith,

2022). Synchronously, they can sustain testimonial injustice by treating student voice as suspect (Kidd, Battaly and Cassam, 2021).

## Conclusion

Read together, the three UK policies reproduce academic integrity as a disciplinary mechanism rather than an equitable collaborative practice. Across all five themes, Eurocentric norms are assumed as universal, with little acknowledgement of alternative epistemologies or intersectional identities. Deficit discourses persist, misunderstandings are attributed student weakness rather than institutional opacity, while epistemic dominance is enacted through a failure to define academic integrity and the reliance on complex legalistic English. Institutional power is reinforced through juridical language, dense procedures, and surveillance framings that affirm institutional authority. Homogenisation of ‘the student’ erases complex racialised identities, obscuring compound sites of oppression arising from inequitable starting points. Finally, student voice is limited to defence and entirely excluded from policy creation.

There are some positives: tiered developmental responses in Policy A, brevity in Policy B, and staff accountability in Policy C, though these are partial and insufficient. In DAF terms, diachronic colonial logics of classification and surveillance appear to remain embedded, while synchronically, whiteness continues to monopolise legitimacy and voice.

## Analysis Conclusion

Taken together, the three strands of analysis reveal a consistent pattern: academic integrity is governed less as a developmental pedagogical practice than as a mechanism of discipline structured by colonial and racialised logics. Deficit discourses frame GSIP students as lacking; epistemic dominance naturalises Eurocentric norms; institutional power enacts opacity and surveillance; homogenisation erases intersectionality; and student voice and agency are constricted. Decolonial advances do appear, such as multilingual methods, reflexivity and shared staff responsibility. However, these are partial and insufficiently sustained, failing to offset the systemic reproduction of inequity experienced by GSIP students in UK universities.

The DAF's thematic organisation shows that GSIP students' experiences and representations are not isolated challenges, but structural effects embedded across research, pedagogy and governance. Diachronic readings expose continuations of colonial hierarchies of knowledge and categorisation, while synchronic readings show how these endure today through whiteness, suspicion and silencing. Together, the analyses demonstrate that academic integrity practices and procedures can function as barriers to equitable participation for GSIP students, even when institutions claim neutrality or inclusion. The following chapter discusses the broader implications of these findings and considers how academic integrity can be reimagined as a collaborative practice and how the DAF can be refined as a critical tool for decolonial analysis.

## 6. DISCUSSION

### Introduction

This chapter synthesises the findings and analyses to address the research question. It brings together dominant patterns from all the sources analysed in the previous chapter (the UK corpus, scholarship and policy), to evaluate how academic integrity is perceived and experienced by GSIP students in UK universities, as well as, how it is constructed in scholarship and policy. Each pattern: opacity, responsibility, Enlightenment authority, Whiteness, surveillance, identity and agency, is examined through a decolonial lens, reflecting the dissertation's aims. This chapter also reflects on piloting the DAF, including both its strengths and limitations.

### Dominant Patterns

#### Opacity and Responsibility

A recurring thread across both research and policy is how opacity and individual responsibility intersect to shape GSIP students' experiences of academic integrity. Many student participants in both the UK Corpus and wider GN studies experienced academic integrity practices and procedures as dense systems to be navigated under conditions of uncertainty and suspicion. As Davis (2022) and Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku (2024) show, regulations are often described as confusing or accusatory, signalling that comprehension may be neither automatic nor equitably distributed. Bureaucratic density, ambiguous definitions, and juridical terminology render policies difficult to interpret, transforming them into what Shore and Wright, (2011, p. 15) term neoliberal 'technologies of governance'; that is, they appear neutral but operate as mechanisms of control.

Opacity in policy is mirrored by opacity in research design. Many of the UK Corpus studies are qualitative, but they provide little detail about their paradigmatic, theoretical or analytical design (Holliman *et al.*, 2023; Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku, 2024; Strachan, Oguna and Oruche, 2024). Findings are presented as descriptive themes of generic difficulties, with minimal acknowledgment of how they are shaped by Eurocentric epistemologies. This methodological vagueness reproduces the barriers and unequitable power dynamics that GSIP students encounter institutionally; rules are fixed but not fully explained, and failure to comply reflects personal deficit rather than systemic opacity.

Responsibility discourses compound these exclusions. The three policies routinely state that students are responsible for familiarising themselves with academic integrity regulations and developing appropriate academic skills. In the UK Corpus, Zhuang and Bell (2024) highlight GSIP students who felt undervalued while Strachan, Oguna and Oruche (2024) document sanctions imposed without adequate pedagogic scaffolding. Wider GN studies reinforce this pattern (Birks *et al.*, 2020; Cutri *et al.*, 2021). Therefore, responsibility is consistently positioned downward, onto GSIP students, while opacity shields institutions from accountability.

Read diachronically, these dynamics reflect colonial governance legacies in which opacity and deficit were instruments for ruling colonised peoples, who were framed as perpetually lacking (Quijano, 2000; Said, 2003; Andreotti, 2011). Synchronously, these dynamics enact deficit thinking by reframing systemic complexity as individual weakness (Valencia, 2010; Valencia and Solorzano, 2012). This can result in GSIP

students perceiving and experiencing UK academic integrity practices as a disciplinary mechanism or gatekeeping devices that prevent students' equitable participation in the academic community.

Regarding the research aims, this section highlights that opacity and responsibility, far from being neutral institutional features, can be central obstacles for GSIP students in the UK, shaping their perceptions and experiences of academic integrity and creating mistrust, fear and a feeling of being problematised. Regarding the objectives, the analysis shows how scholarly and institutional discourses can sustain deficit framings while rendering institutional responsibility invisible.

## **Enlightenment Authority**

GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity are shaped not only by the opacity of regulations and practice, but also by the epistemic traditions that underpin them. Across, policy and research, UK academic integrity is framed as if its principles such as, honesty, respect, and originality, were timeless and universal. However, these categories are historically situated in Enlightenment Europe and were institutionalised through colonial expansion (Tuhiwai Smith, 2022). Institutional policies exemplify this legacy by failing to define academic integrity in practical terms and by framing it solely in terms of breaches and compliance (Anonymised Institution C, 2024; Anonymised Institution A, 2025; Anonymised Institution B, 2025), reflecting Perkins and Roe's (2024) critique that GN HEI academic integrity policies lack explicitness. The sustained and unquestioned dominance of Enlightenment values means that, though GSIP students may find UK academic integrity unfamiliar, its authority is rarely fully explained or contextualised.

The same assumptions pervade much of the scholarship, which presents UK academic integrity concepts and practices as universal while neither contextualising them nor recognising plurality (Sbaffi and Zhao, 2022; Ajit, Maikkara and Ramku, 2024; Chowdhury, Rahman and McCray, 2024). This sustains Enlightenment rationalism through Othering (Spivak, 1990; Said, 2003). Creswell, 2013 (p. 214) states ‘no longer is it acceptable to be the omniscient, distanced qualitative writer’. However, across the UK Corpus, few researchers situate themselves or interrogate their positionality. This lack of reflexivity can be read as sustaining Harris's (1993) concept of whiteness as property ; that is, monopolising authority over knowledge through unacknowledged Eurocentric scholarship norms.

Consequentially, GSIP students can experience academic integrity processes as mechanisms that delegitimise their diverse prior learning and multilingualism. Zhuang and Bell (2024) highlight how gaps between IELTS entry scores and institutionally presumed UK academic literacies act as gatekeeping, while Gao, (2025, p. 5) documents how English only ideology recasts academic and linguistic diversity as deficiency. As such, Eurocentric conventions can severely restrict GSIP students' voices and knowledge, reflecting Okello's (2023) concept of epistemic asphyxiation.

Diachronically, this illustrates how Enlightenment ideals became institutionalised as universal authoritative categories, subordinating diverse epistemologies (Yin, 2024). Synchronically, CRT clarifies how these ideals persist as forms of racialised epistemic supremacy: in both research and policy, whiteness retains proprietary control over legitimacy (Pham, 2023; Cabrera *et al.*, 2024).

Regarding the research question, the implication is that GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity are shaped by unexplained practices that naturalise Enlightenment categories as unquestioned "truths". Regarding the aims and objectives, this demonstrates that academic integrity processes can often obstruct rather than support equitable learning experiences by sustaining epistemic exclusion.

## **Whiteness and Surveillance**

GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity seem are consistently mediated through apparatuses of surveillance and suspicion. Rather than experiencing academic integrity processes as a supportive pedagogical framework, students often describe them as disciplinary system that can assume guilt. Davis (2022) records students experiencing academic misconduct processes as threatening and interrogatory, while Owusu-Kwarteng (2021) highlights teaching practices that reinforce racialised suspicion rather than building trust. Policies reinforce this dynamic: all three employ criminalising language, directly aligning with CRT's critique of racialised deviance and criminality as socially constructed (Delgado and Stefancic, 2023). This framing positions GSIP students as perpetual suspects rather than members of the academic community and co-producers of knowledge.

At the level of research design, the same dynamics appear. Davis (2022) includes student testimonies but subordinated them to staff interpretations, while Strachan, Oguna and Oruche (2024) treat GSIP student honesty itself as a methodological limitation. Both approaches can disempower GSIP students' epistemic authority, confirming Kidd, Battaly and Cassam's (2021) critique of testimonial injustice and

Spivak's (1988) concept of subaltern silencing. GSIP students' testimonies are permitted, but generally only when their lived experiences conform to institutional praxis.

Diachronically, these patterns echo Enlightenment legacies, when universities operated as arbiters of morality and discipline (Hall, 1995; Mignolo, 2011; van der Lugt, 2018). Synchronically, they manifest as contemporary forms of surveillance within juridical and sometimes, prejudicial framings (Bannister, Peñalver and Urbieta, 2024; Cabrera *et al.*, 2024).

Regarding the research question, these findings emphasise that GSIP students can perceive and experience academic integrity as a mechanism of governance. Regarding the aims, this analysis demonstrates that UK academic integrity practices and procedures can obstruct equitable participation by criminalising epistemic diversity and sustaining whiteness as the gatekeeper of academic legitimacy.

## **Identity and Agency**

The analysis reveals that GSIP students' perceptions and experiences of academic integrity are inseparable from how their identities are represented, and how their voices are recognised within academic integrity practices. Across both policy and research, GSIP students are homogenised into either the generic category of 'all students' or the reductive monolith of 'the international student' while their voices are filtered through deficit or compliance frameworks. Responsibility is individualised to students, but their complex intersectional realities remain unrecognised. This misrecognition can be read as erasing, silencing or essentialising, thereby constraining GSIP students' agency.

In research design, Astley (2024) exemplifies overt essentialism by relying on Hofstede's (2010) cultural dimensions model, which reduces Indian GSIP students to static, infantilised, and at times, dehumanising stereotypes. This methodological essentialism silences lived complexities by translating diverse experiences into over simplified colonial caricatures, exemplifying Spivak's (1988) subaltern silencing and Said's Othering (2003).

The absence of intersectional framing silences how GSIP student identities overlap to produce multiple sites of oppression. While Strachan, Oguna and Oruche (2024) and Zhuang and Bell (2024) record compounded experiences of racism, financial stresses, and family responsibility these findings remain marginal compared to their dominant homogenised framings. As Crenshaw (1991) argues, ignoring the intersections of race, gender and visa status intensifies inequity.

However, counter-examples exist. Owusu-Kwarteng (2021) resists homogenisation by disaggregating West African students' identities and critically situating researcher positionality, while Gao (2025) advances further by employing CRT methodology, including participant diaries as counter-storytelling methods that enable students to narrate raciolinguistic exclusion as systemic racism rather than personal failure. These studies suggest that by creating space for intersectional identities and counter-storytelling, participatory discourses can amplify and dignify GSIP students' voices and agency.

Regarding this dissertation's aims and objectives, this emerging theme demonstrates that GSIP students experience homogenisation, essentialism and silencing as barriers to equitable participation in UK academic integrity.

## **Reflections on the Decolonial Analytical Framework**

This dissertation developed and piloted the Decolonial Analytical Framework (DAF) (see Table 3): a novel contribution that fills a significant gap in research and provides a means of systematically applying decolonial praxis. Piloting the DAF has produced insights into how GSIP students can perceive and experience academic integrity in UK universities. The DAF's five themes: deficit discourse, epistemic dominance, institutional power, identity, and voice and agency, provided a scaffold for systematically and critically analysing findings, scholarship and policies across diverse sources. It included guiding questions from Lomer, Taha and Hayes, (2023, p. 77) which were effective in surfacing not only exclusionary framings but also decolonial practices.

A key strength of the DAF is its combination of both diachronic and synchronic readings, drawing on PCT critiques of colonialism and CRT's focus on contemporary racialisation. As Meghji (2022) argues, theorising coloniality and race together prevents the erasure of structural legacies while situating them in present day inequitable lived experiences. Similarly, Kudo, (2023) demonstrates how Enlightenment ideals remain embedded in GN academic traditions. The DAF's dual analysis enabled this research to avoid both ahistoricism and presentism by mapping continuities between past and present. This was critical for answering the research question: situating GSIP students' perceptions and experiences within wider structures of racialised power dynamics,

revealed how students' lived experiences are shaped by both inherited and current exclusionary mechanisms.

At the same time, the DAF reveals areas for reflection. Its five themes inevitably overlap: opacity can be read as institutional power, epistemic dominance or voice and agency; and essentialism as deficit, identity, or voice and agency. This overlap reflects the complex reality that GSIP students are not reducible to singular categories, but experience UK academic integrity through intersecting dimensions. As Moosavi (2022) illustrates, the stigmatisation of East Asian students is simultaneously a deficit framing, a form of essentialism, and epistemic exclusion. Treating the five themes as porous therefore surfaces decolonial complexity. Future recommendations for the DAF will be discussed in the next chapter.

## Conclusion

This discussion has shown that GSIP students' perceptions of UK academic integrity are deeply shaped by the structural inequities embedded in both scholarship and policy. Academic integrity processes are often experienced as dense, disciplinary systems in which opacity, deficit framings and homogenisation reinforce suspicion and constrain student agency. At the same time, counter-examples such as multilingual interviewing, reflective scholarship, and staff responsibility policy clauses, highlight opportunities for decolonial praxis. The appraisal of the DAF demonstrates its value as a diagnostic tool of decolonial praxis, capable of revealing how colonial legacies and racialised inequities continue to shape contemporary UK HE.

This chapter confirms that UK HE academic integrity practices and processes can act as barriers to, rather than enablers of, equitable academic participation for GSIP students. The next and final chapter outlines the implications of this for policy, practice and future research.

## 7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For over thirty years, research has documented inequitable experiences of GSI students within GN academic integrity systems (Parnther, 2022; Eaton, 2024c) . This dissertation demonstrates that these inequities persist: GSIP students can perceive and experience academic integrity in UK universities as a complex site of compounded exclusions, where deficit discourses, moral suspicion, and punitive approaches continue to position them as conditional or suspect members of academic communities, regardless of if misconduct is alleged.

Through a decolonial framework, this dissertation has critically examined not only how GSIP students perceive and experience academic integrity, but also why these inequities endure and how they might be addressed.

Some recent studies have begun to disaggregate GSIP student participants, offering potential for richer intersectional insights. However, many continue to homogenise GSIP students, reproducing cultural pathologisation and GN confirmation biases. Academic integrity remains primarily defined through abstraction and breaches such as plagiarism, casting GSIP students as suspects rather than legitimate knowledge agents.

The analysis of UK HE policies revealed how opacity, ranging from complex legalistic and moralistic language to the absence of definitions, functions as a structural barrier, leaving GSIP students disproportionately vulnerable to punitive consequences. Appeals mechanisms were found to be similarly opaque, while responsibility was repeatedly attributed to students rather than institutions.

Through the DAF, this dissertation demonstrates how academic integrity discourses can reproduce diachronic colonial legacies and synchronic racialised exclusions. The DAF's synthesis of PCT and CRT further revealed academic integrity to be a deeply political question of epistemic justice. PCT argues how Enlightenment ideals, such as truth and validity, are inseparable from colonial power (Spivak, 1988; Hall, 1995; Said, 2003); this study found that they remain markers of academic legitimacy. CRT's concept of whiteness as property (Harris, 1993) illuminated how whiteness continues to secure dominance over GSIP students' voice and epistemic agency.

That inequitable experiences of academic integrity have been documented for decades without sustained reform raises questions about institutional priorities. In this context, CRT's principle of interest convergence (Bell, 1980) suggests that the UK Government and universities have often valued GSIP students primarily for their tuition fee income rather than as co-producers of knowledge (HM Government, 2019; Department for Education UK, 2020; McKenna, 2022). This dissertation argues that inequitable treatment of GSIP students has remained unaddressed because it has not threatened institutional financial interests.

However, this model has now been destabilised. Precarity in student visa routes, rising xenophobia, and a cost-of-living crisis have contributed to a decline in GSIP student enrolments, pushing UK universities into financial crisis (Habib and Hastings, 2025; Rowsell, 2025; Universities UK, 2025b). In this shifting landscape, UK universities face a critical opportunity to reorient away from financial extraction and towards meaningful inclusion of GSIP students through sustained decolonial praxis.

## **Recommendations**

This study has revealed both conceptual and practical gaps in current approaches to UK academic integrity. By way of conclusion, it now offers the following recommendations to address them.

## **Future Research**

1. Move beyond methodological nationalism and deficit repair. Future research must move past Eurocentric and individualised deficit approaches (Tuhiwai Smith, 2022; Unkule, 2023) to centre GSIP students' voices. Action-orientated research, co-produced with GSIP students and graduates, is essential. Creative counter-storytelling methods should be embedded in both design and dissemination, enabling GSIP students to reshape the narratives in which they are framed.
2. Enhance greater methodological transparency and reflexivity. Future studies should provide greater methodological detail, explicit theoretical framing, and reflexive researcher positionality, mitigating the presumed neutrality of Eurocentric academia and ensuring accountability in interpretation.

3. Develop the DAF further. Building on this dissertation's pilot, future doctoral research should refine and validate the DAF through qualitative, co-designed empirical inquiry with GSIP students and graduates, centring lived experience to actively shape the field and produce tangible, decolonial outputs.

## **Policy**

1. From compliance to dignity. UK universities must move beyond compliance and towards dignity by embedding equity and epistemic justice in governance. Academic integrity policies should be systematically reviewed to eliminate opaque and assumptive deviant language, provide clear and inclusive definitions, and enhance accessibility in both content and document location.
2. Integrate the DAF into institutional reviews. Embedding the DAF within Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) would enable institutions to evaluate whether their policies disproportionately disadvantage GSIP students, fostering accountability through co-production.
3. Acknowledge colonial legacies. Institutions must consciously recognise their Enlightenment influences and colonial inheritances when redesigning policy. Without this critical positionality; academic integrity procedures will continue to reproduce racialised inequity under the guise of neutrality and universality.

## **Practice**

1. Reconceptualise academic integrity as collaboration. Academic integrity should be understood as a coproduced and developmental practice involving the entire

academic community. Teaching must be iterative, decolonial, and embedded across curricula rather than confined to inductions or misconduct interventions.

2. Equip staff through decolonial praxis. Staff development programmes should include anti-racist and decolonial praxis training, enabling staff to explore their own positionalities and to practically address epistemic inequities in teaching, assessment, and support services.
3. Centre GSIP student co-production. GSIP students should play a meaningful role in co-designing policy and pedagogy, including creating multilingual resources and counter-storytelling workshops that enhance student agency and institutional learning. Student participation must be voluntary, paid, and dignified.
4. Embed academic integrity within EDI agendas. Academic integrity should be integrated into wider EDI strategies to reposition it as a social justice-oriented practice, aligning with institutional commitments to equity and belonging.

## **Towards Epistemic Justice**

This dissertation's analyses converge on a central insight: academic integrity cannot remain defined by procedural compliance or assumed neutrality under the guise of Enlightenment ideals. It must be re-imagined as a question of epistemic justice; that is, how UK universities legitimise diverse ways of knowing within an increasingly interconnected and rapidly evolving educational landscape.

This dissertation offers not only critique but an urgent call for a decolonial framework genuinely capable of evaluating whether UK HE scholarship, policy and practice

reproduce epistemic violence or foster dignified and equitable belonging. In doing so, it offers a long overdue roadmap towards epistemic and methodological justice.

## 8. REFERENCES

Abdulrahman, H. K. *et al.* (2021) 'Revisiting (inclusive) education in the postcolony', *Journal of the British Academy*, 9(S1), pp. 47–75. doi: 10.5871/jba/009s1.047.

Adam, L. (2024) 'Framing Students' Perspectives on Academic Integrity', in Eaton, S. E. (ed.) *Second Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 503–521. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5\_187.

Adriansen, H. K. and Spangler, V. (2023) 'REFLECTING ON INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND RESEARCHER POSITIONALITY', *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 207–215. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-26/REFLECTING-INTERNATIONAL-STUDENTS-RESEARCHER-POSITIONALITY-HANNE-KIRSTINE-ADRIANSEN-VERA-SPANGLER.

AdvanceHE (2025) *Home | Advance HE*. Available at: <https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/> (Accessed: 23 September 2025).

Ajit, S., Maikkara, A. and Ramku, W. (2024) 'Fear of failure: a student-facing investigation into the motivations for contract cheating and academic misconduct', *Cogent Education*, 11(1), p. doi: 10.1080/2331186X.2024.2413211.

Anderson, R. D. (2004) *European universities from the Enlightenment to 1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Andreotti, V. (2011) *Actionable Postcolonial Theory in Education*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. Available at: <https://ereader.perlego.com/1/book/3502924/7>.

Anonymised Institution C (2024) 'Policy C'. Available at: <https://www.uwe.ac.uk/study/academic-information/assessments/academic-integrity>.

Anonymised Institution A (2025) 'Policy A'. Available at: <https://www.southwales.ac.uk/media/university-of-south-wales/site-assets/documents/academic-registry/FINAL-Academic-Integrity-Regulations-2025-26.pdf>.

Anonymised Institution B (2025) 'Policy B'. Available at: <https://www.westminster.ac.uk/current-students/guides-and-policies/academic-matters/academic-misconduct>.

Astley, M. (2024) 'Cross-Cultural Challenges Faced by International Students: A Case Study of Indian Postgraduate Students at a London-Based Business School', *Journal of International Students*, 14(4), pp. 971–988. doi: 10.32674/jis.v14i4.6765.

Bai, L. and Wang, Y. X. (2024) 'Combating Language and Academic Culture Shocks-International Students' Agency in Mobilizing Their Cultural Capital', *Journal of diversity in higher education*, 17(2), pp. 215–228. doi: 10.1037/dhe0000409.

Bamberger, A. (2022) 'From Human Capital To Marginalized Other: a Systematic Review of Diaspora and Internationalization in Higher Education', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 70(3), pp. 363–385. doi: 10.1080/00071005.2021.1925084.

Bamberger, A. and Morris, P. (2024) 'Critical perspectives on internationalization in higher education: commercialization, global citizenship, or postcolonial imperialism?', *Critical Studies in Education*, 65(2), pp. 128–146. doi: 10.1080/17508487.2023.2233572.

Bannister, P., Peñalver, E. and Urbieta, A. (2024) 'International Students and

Generative Artificial Intelligence: A Cross-Cultural Exploratory Analysis of Higher Education Academic Integrity Policy', *Journal of International Students*, 14(3), pp. 149–170. doi: 10.32674/jis.v14i3.6277.

Barnett, R. (1994) 'Power, enlightenment and quality evaluation: The politics of quality assurance', *European journal of education*, 29(2), pp. 165–179.

Beck, K. (2023) 'Seeing international students', in *Research with International Students Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*. 1st edn. Routledge. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003290803-23>.

Bedford, M. J. and Shaffer, S. (2023) 'Examining Literature Through Tenets of Critical Race Theory: A Pedagogical Approach for the ELA Classroom', *Multicultural Perspectives*, 25(1), pp. 4–20. doi: 10.1080/15210960.2022.2162523.

Bell, D. A. J. (1980) 'Brown v . Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma Author ( s ): Derrick A . Bell , Jr . Published by : The Harvard Law Review Association Stable URL : <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1340546>', *Handbook of Critical Whiteness: Deconstructing Dominant Discourses Across Disciplines*, 93(3), pp. 518–533.

Bennett, B. *et al.* (2023) 'Australian Universities, Indigenization, Whiteness, and Settler Colonial Epistemic Violence', *Handbook of Critical Whiteness*, pp. 1–14. doi: 10.1007/978-981-19-1612-0\_63-1.

BERA (2024) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research, fifth edition (2024)* | BERA. Available at: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-fifth-edition-2024> (Accessed: 18 May 2024).

Bhabha, H. K. (2012) *The Location of Culture*. 2nd edn. Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780203820551.

Bhambra, G. K. (2014) 'Postcolonial and decolonial dialogues', *Postcolonial Studies*, 17(2), pp. 115–121. doi: 10.1080/13688790.2014.966414.

Bhati, A. (2023) 'What can postcolonial theory contribute to the study of social equity?', *Public Administration Review*, 83(1), pp. 203–209. doi: 10.1111/puar.13523.

Biesta, G. (2007) 'Towards the knowledge democracy? Knowledge production and the civic role of the university', *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 26(5), pp. 467–479. doi: 10.1007/s11217-007-9056-0.

Birks, M. *et al.* (2020) 'Managing the mutations: Academic misconduct Australia, New Zealand, and the UK', *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 16(1), pp. 1–15. doi: 10.1007/s40979-020-00055-5.

Biswas, A. (2023) 'Countering Hegemonic Knowledge in Cross-Cultural Research: Hofstede, Epistemic Violence and Imperialism', *Journal of Critical Southern Studies*, 4(2023), pp. 1–9. doi: 10.3943/jcss.43.

Blackmore, J. (2001) 'UNIVERSITIES IN CRISIS? KNOWLEDGE ECONOMIES, EMANCIPATORY PEDAGOGIES, AND THE CRITICAL INTELLECTUAL.', *Educational Theory*, 51(3), p. 353. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-5446.2001.00353.x.

Bolton, P., Lewis, J. and Gower, M. (2024) *International students in UK higher education*, House of Commons Library. Available at: <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-7976/CBP-7976.pdf>.

Bolton, P., Lewis, J. and Gower, M. (2025) *International students in UK higher education*.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2022) *Thematic Analysis A Practical Guide*. SAGE Publications.

Bretag, T. and Mahmud, S. (2016) 'A Conceptual Framework for Implementing Exemplary Academic Integrity Policy in Australian Higher Education BT - Handbook of Academic Integrity', in Bretag, T. (ed.) *Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Singapore:

Springer Singapore, pp. 463–480. doi: 10.1007/978-981-287-098-8\_24.

Brooks, R. M. (2024) ‘Integrity Through Experience: Fostering a Culture of Academic Integrity Through an Experiential Learning Approach’, in Eaton, S. E. (ed.) *Second Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 287–303. doi: 10.1007/978-981-287-079-7\_94-1.

Brown, M. (2023) ‘Colonialism and penalty’, in *The Routledge International Handbook on Decolonizing Justice*. Taylor and Francis, pp. 380–390. doi: 10.4324/9781003176619-39.

Brunsting, N. C. et al. (2024) ‘Differential Adjustment Outcomes of International Students at U.S. Universities: Examining the Intersections of Region of Origin, Gender, and Graduate Level’, *Journal of International Students*, 14(3), pp. 448–467. doi: 10.32674/JIS.V14I3.4798.

Buckner, E. et al. (2021) ‘Diversity without Race: How University Internationalization Strategies Discuss International Students.’, *Journal of International Students*, 11(S1), pp. 32–49.

Cabrera, N. L. et al. (2024) ‘CRTToP: toward a critical race theory of power in higher education’, *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 00(00), pp. 1–18. doi: 10.1080/13613324.2024.2306380.

Carbado, D. W. and Harris, C. I. (2019) ‘Intersectionality at 30: Mapping the margins of anti-essentialism, intersectionality, and dominance theory’, *Harvard Law Review*, 132(8), pp. 2193–2239.

Carey, D. and Festa, L. M. (2009) *The postcolonial enlightenment eighteenth-century colonialisms and postcolonial theory*. Edited by D. Carey and L. M. (Lynn M. Festa. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CASP (2024) ‘CASP Checklist for Qualitative Research’, *Critical Appraisal Skills Programme*, pp. 1–6. Available at: [www.casp-uk.net](http://www.casp-uk.net).

Chadderton, C. (2013) ‘Towards a research framework for race in education: Critical race theory and Judith Butler’, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(1), pp. 39–55. doi: 10.1080/09518398.2011.650001.

Chakrabarty, D. (2021) ‘POSTCOLONIALITY AND THE ARTIFICE OF HISTORY: WHO SPEAKS FOR “INDIAN” PASTS?\*’, in Mongia, P. (ed.) *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory*. First. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 223–247. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003135593>.

Chowdhury, S., Rahman, M. N. and McCray, D. (2024) ‘International Postgraduate Students’ Perceptions of Learning Difficulties and Their Impact on Academic Performance in British Universities’, *Studies in Educational Management*, 15, pp. 20–34. doi: 10.32038/SEM.2024.15.02.

Christian, M., Seamster, L. and Ray, V. (2021) ‘Critical Race Theory and Empirical Sociology’, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 65(8), pp. 1019–1026. doi: 10.1177/0002764219859646.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2017) *Research Methods in Education*. Eighth edi, *Research Methods in Education*. Eighth edi. Edited by L. Manion and K. (Keith R. B. . Morrison. London, England ; Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9781315456539.

Coleman, P. (2022) ‘Validity and Reliability within Qualitative Research for the Caring Sciences’. Available at: <http://www.internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org/> (Accessed: 7 September 2025).

Crenshaw, K. (1991) ‘Mapping the margins: Identity politics, intersectionality, and violence against women’, *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), pp. 1241–1299.

Crenshaw, K. et al. (eds) (1995) *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed The Movement*. New York: The New Press.

Crenshaw, K. (2018) 'Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics', *Living With Contradictions: Controversies In Feminist Social Ethics*, 1989(1), pp. 39–52. doi: 10.4324/9780429499142-5.

Creswell, J. W. (2013) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Third. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crichlow, W. (2023) 'Decolonial criminology: Oxymoron for necrocapitalism, racial capitalism, and the westernization of the professoriate', in *The Routledge International Handbook on Decolonizing Justice*. Taylor and Francis, pp. 459–468. doi: 10.4324/9781003176619-47.

Cutri, J. et al. (2021) 'Academic integrity at doctoral level: the influence of the imposter phenomenon and cultural differences on academic writing', *International journal for educational integrity*, 17(1), pp. 1–16. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00074-w.

Davis, M. (2022) 'Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional academic integrity policies, procedures, teaching and support', *International journal for educational integrity*, 18(1), pp. 1–20. doi: 10.1007/s40979-022-00108-x.

Decuir, J. T. and Dixson, A. D. (2004) "So When It Comes Out, They Aren't That Surprised That It Is There": Using Critical Race Theory as a Tool of Analysis of Race and Racism in Education', *Educational Researcher*, 33(5), pp. 26–31. doi: 10.3102/0013189X033005026.

Delanty, G. (1998) 'The idea of the university in the global era: From knowledge as an end to the end of knowledge?', *Social epistemology*, 12(1), pp. 3–25. doi: 10.1080/02691729808578856.

Delgado, R. and Stefancic, J. (2023) *Critical Race Theory*. Fourth Edi. New York, USA: New York University Press.

Denisova-Schmidt, E. (2024) 'Academic Integrity and International Students: An Inclusive Approach', in Eaton, S. E. (ed.) *Second Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 1187–1200. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5\_130.

Department for Education UK (2020) *UK education related exports and transnational education activity 2018*. London. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5fd8ecf28fa8f54d6480f579/Education\\_Exports\\_2018\\_Technical\\_Document.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5fd8ecf28fa8f54d6480f579/Education_Exports_2018_Technical_Document.pdf) (Accessed: 14 December 2024).

Dickson, M., Bradley, L. and Read, B. (2024) 'International student-parents in UK higher education: A temporal analysis of their intersectional experiences and challenges', *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 98, p. 101933. doi: 10.1016/J.IJINTREL.2024.101933.

Dollinger, M., Gupta, S. and Nguyen, T. (2023) 'It's only fiction until it exists Co-designing research with international students', in *Research with International Students*. 1st edn. Routledge. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003290803-28>.

Draper, M. and Boland, M. (2024) 'Contract Cheating: Legal, Regulatory, and Policy Responses BT - Second Handbook of Academic Integrity', in Eaton, S. E. (ed.). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 729–746. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5\_114.

Dutta, U., Azad, A. K. and Hussain, S. M. (2022) 'Counterstorytelling as Epistemic Justice: Decolonial Community-based Praxis from the Global South', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 69(1–2), pp. 59–70. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12545>.

Eaton, S. E. (2022) 'New priorities for academic integrity: equity, diversity, inclusion, decolonization and Indigenization', *International journal for educational integrity*, 18(1), pp. 1–12. doi: 10.1007/s40979-022-00105-0.

Eaton, S. E. (2024a) 'Comprehensive Academic Integrity(CAI):An Ethical Framework for EducationalContexts', in *Second Handbook of Academic Integrity*, pp. 1–14.

Eaton, S. E. (2024b) 'Global Perspectives on Academic Integrity: Introduction BT - Second Handbook of Academic Integrity', in Eaton, S. E. (ed.) *Second Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 17–21. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5\_83.

Eaton, S. E. (ed.) (2024c) *Second Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Springer Nature Switzerland.

Eteng, B. G. *et al.* (2024) 'Female education for social development and Re-cultivating academic integrity among undergraduates of tertiary institutions in southern cross river state, nigeria', *Global Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(1), pp. 75–88. doi: 10.4314/GJSS.V23I1.6.

Fadlalmola, H. A. *et al.* (2022) 'Plagiarism among nursing students: A systematic review and meta-analysis', *International nursing review*, 69(4), pp. 492–502. doi: 10.1111/inr.12755.

Fanon, F. (2021) *The Wretched of the Earth*. 60th Anniv. New York, USA: Grove Press.

Fay, R. *et al.* (2023) 'Linguistic diversity in research with and by international students', *Considerations for research design and practice*. 1st edn. Routledge. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003290803-31>.

Fitzpatrick, M. (2004) *The Enlightenment world*. Edited by M. Fitzpatrick. London ; Routledge (Routledge worlds).

Foltýnek, T. and Glendinning, I. (2024) 'European Cooperation in Academic Integrity BT - Second Handbook of Academic Integrity', in Eaton, S. E. (ed.). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 1001–1015. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5\_176.

Foste, Z. (2020) 'The Enlightenment Narrative: White Student Leaders' Preoccupation With Racial Innocence', *Journal of diversity in higher education*, 13(1), pp. 33–43. doi: 10.1037/dhe0000113.

Fougère, M. and Moulettes, A. (2007) 'The construction of the modern west and the backward rest: Studying the discourse of hofstede's Culture's Consequences', *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 2(1), pp. 1–19. doi: 10.2167/md051.0.

Gaižauskaitė, I. *et al.* (2020) *Academic Integrity Self-Evaluation Tools Report (revised version) Erasmus+ project 'European Network for Academic Integrity'*. Available at: <http://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/>. (Accessed: 3 November 2024).

Ganann, R., Ciliska, D. and Thomas, H. (2010) 'Expediting systematic reviews: Methods and implications of rapid reviews', *Implementation Science*, 5(1), pp. 1–10. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-5-56.

Gandhi, L. (2020) *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*, *Postcolonial Theory: A critical introduction*. Taylor and Francis. doi: 10.4324/9781003116714.

Gao, S. (2025) 'Language Ideologies of Racial Microaggression and Institutional Whiteness: Experiences of Chinese International Students in UK Higher Education', *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 29(2), pp. 97–108. doi: 10.1111/josl.12693.

Glass, C. R., Heng, T. T. and Hou, M. (2022) 'Intersections of identity and status in international students' perceptions of culturally engaging campus environments', *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 89, pp. 19–29. doi: 10.1016/J.IJINTREL.2022.05.003.

Goodier, M. (2025) *Revealed: Thousands of UK university students caught cheating using AI* | Higher education | The Guardian, The Guardian. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2025/jun/15/thousands-of-uk-university-students-caught-cheating-using-ai-artificial-intelligence-survey> (Accessed: 24 September 2025).

Grant, M. J. and Booth, A. (2009) 'A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies', *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 26(2), pp. 91–108. doi: 10.1111/J.1471-1842.2009.00848.X.

Gregory, J. L. (2021) 'Plagiarism as a Social Contract, a New Way to Approach Plagiarism', *Journal of academic ethics*, 19(3), pp. 407–424. doi: 10.1007/s10805-021-09409-1.

Grove, J. (2024) *ChatGPT: student AI cheating cases soar at UK universities*, *Times Higher Education*. Available at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/student-ai-cheating-cases-soar-uk-universities> (Accessed: 24 September 2025).

Guhin, J. and Wyrtzen, J. (2013) *The violences of knowledge: Edward Said, sociology, and post-orientalist reflexivity, Political Power and Social Theory*. doi: 10.1108/S0198-8719(2013)0000024015.

Habib, A. and Hastings, M. (2025) *Rethinking the Financial Challenge of English Universities* - HEPI, Higher Education Policy Institute. Available at: <https://www.hepi.ac.uk/2025/01/21/rethinking-the-financial-challenge-of-english-universities/> (Accessed: 7 October 2025).

Hall, R., Ansley, L. and Connolly, P. (2023) 'Decolonising or anti-racism? Exploring the limits of possibility in higher education', *Teaching in Higher Education*. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2023.2201676.

Hall, S. (1995) 'The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power', in Hall, S. and Gieben, B. (eds) *Formations of Modernity*. 4th edn. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 275–333.

Harper, S. R. (2012) 'Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms', *Review of Higher Education*, 36(1 SUPPL.), pp. 9–29. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2012.0047.

Harrad, R., Keasley, R. and Jefferies, L. (2024) 'Academic integrity or academic misconduct? Conceptual difficulties in higher education and the potential contribution of student demographic factors', *Higher Education Research and Development*, 43(7), pp. 1556–1570. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2024.2339833.

Harris, C. I. (1993) 'WHITENESS AS PROPERTY', *Harvard Law Review*, 106(8), pp. 1710–1791.

Haug, S., Braveboy-Wagner, J. and Maihold, G. (2021) 'The "Global South" in the study of world politics: examining a meta category', *Third World Quarterly*, 42(9), pp. 1923–1944. doi: 10.1080/01436597.2021.1948831.

Hegde, M. and Inamdar, N. (2023) 'State-university relations and its implication on internationalization of higher education', *Power and education*, 15(3), pp. 362–376. doi: 10.1177/1757743822119323.

Heleta, S. and Chasi, S. (2023) 'Rethinking and redefining internationalisation of higher education in South Africa using a decolonial lens', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 45(3), pp. 261–275. doi: 10.1080/1360080X.2022.2146566.

Heng, Tang T. and Lu, N. (2023) 'STEREOTYPES OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS: Reflecting on our scholarly responsibilities through conceptual framings', *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 44–53. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-7/STEREOTYPES-INTERNATIONAL-STUDENTS-TANG-HENG-NANNAN-LU.

Heng, T T and Lu, N. (2023) 'Stereotypes of international students', in *Reflecting on our scholarly responsibilities through conceptual framings*. 1st edn. Routledge, pp. 44–53. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003290803-7>.

HEPI (2025) *Student Generative AI Survey 2025* - HEPI. Available at: <https://www.hepi.ac.uk/reports/student-generative-ai-survey-2025/> (Accessed: 4

October 2025).

HM Government (2019) *International Education Strategy - global potential, global growth*. London. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5ccab348e5274a1ac5ce280c/International\\_Education\\_Strategy\\_Accessible.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5ccab348e5274a1ac5ce280c/International_Education_Strategy_Accessible.pdf) (Accessed: 14 December 2024).

Hofstede, G. (2010) *Cultures and organizations: software of the mind*. McGraw Hill.

Holliman, A. J. et al. (2023) 'Exploring the experiences of international Chinese students at a UK university: a qualitative inquiry', *Multicultural Learning and Teaching*, 0(0). doi: 10.1515/mlt-2022-0020.

Honderich, T. (2005) *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/ACREF/9780199264797.001.0001.

Hutcheson, S. (2023) 'CALLING RACE INTO RESEARCH WITH INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS: Confronting omissions', *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 96–106. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-13.

ICAI (2025) *Fundamental Values*, International Center for Academic Integrity. Available at: <https://www.academicintegrity.org/aws/ICAI/pt/sp/values>.

Jindal-Snape, D. (2023) 'RE-CONCEPTUALISING MULTIPLE AND MULTI-DIMENSIONAL TRANSITIONS OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND SIGNIFICANT OTHERS', *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 165–173. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-21/RE-CONCEPTUALISING-MULTIPLE-MULTI-DIMENSIONAL-TRANSITIONS-INTERNATIONAL-STUDENTS-SIGNIFICANT-OTHERS-DIVYA-JINDAL-SNAPE.

Jisc (2025) *Reports - Jisc*. Available at: <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/reports> (Accessed: 23 September 2025).

Khoo, S. M. (2021) 'On decolonial revisions of modern social theory', *International Sociology*, 36(5), pp. 704–719. doi: 10.1177/02685809211057468.

Kidd, I. J., Battaly, H. and Cassam, Q. (2021) *Vice Epistemology*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Kim, H. J. and Uysal, H. (2021) 'Shifting the discourse of plagiarism and ethics: a cultural opportunity in higher education', *International journal of ethics education*, 6(1), pp. 163–176. doi: 10.1007/s40889-020-00113-z.

Kudo, K. (2023) 'Revisiting the Conceptualisation of Intercultural Relationships in Research With International Students', *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 193–203. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-24.

Kumar H.M., S. (2023) 'The Ontology of Postcoloniality and Subaltern Realism: Toward the Restructuring of International Relations at the Level of Meta-Theory', in *Decolonizing Grand Theories*. Singapore: Palgrave Macmillian, pp. 147–180. doi: 10.1007/978-981-99-4841-3.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998) 'Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education?', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), pp. 7–24. doi: 10.1080/095183998236863.

Ladson-Billings, G. and Tate, W. F. (1995) 'Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education', *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), pp. 47–68. doi: 10.1177/016146819509700104.

Lee, K. and Mao, Y. (2025) 'Rethinking internationalisation at a distance from the perspectives of international students: Critical reflection towards epistemic justice',

*British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56(2), pp. 815–833. doi: 10.1111/BJET.13550.

Lin, J. C. P. (2023) ‘Exposing the chameleon-like nature of racism: a multidisciplinary look at critical race theory in higher education’, *Higher Education*, 85(5), pp. 1085–1100. doi: 10.1007/s10734-022-00879-9.

Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham Susan A and Guba, E. G. (2011) ‘Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, And Emerging Confluences, Revisted’, in Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 4th edn. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc., pp. 97–128.

Lomer, S. and Mittelmeier, J. (2023) ‘Mapping the research on pedagogies with international students in the UK: a systematic literature review’, *Teaching in higher education*, 28(6), pp. 1243–1263. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2021.1872532.

Lomer, S., Mittelmeier, J. and Courtney, S. (2023) ‘Typologising internationalisation in UK university strategies: reputation, mission and attitude’, *Higher education research and development*, 42(5), pp. 1042–1056. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2023.2193729.

Lomer, S., Taha, S. H. and Hayes, A. (2023) ‘Deficit Narratives in Research on International Students’, *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 74–84. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-10.

Lootens, E. and Fúnez-Flores, J. I. (2024) ‘Inside the ivory tower, the view from a “space invader”: An exploratory study into the ways racialized PhD students experience white ignorance in elite universities in the UK’, *Sociology Compass*, 18(4), pp. 1–16. doi: 10.1111/soc4.13199.

van der Lugt, M. (2018) ‘The left hand of the enlightenment: Truth, error, and integrity in Bayle and Kant’, *History of European ideas*, 44(3), pp. 277–291. doi: 10.1080/01916599.2018.1440045.

MacLachlan, R. (2024) ‘Academic Integrity: A “Threshold Value” for Higher Education?’, in Rao, M. B., Singh, A., and Rao, P. M. (eds) *Worldviews and Values in Higher Education*. Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 69–80. doi: 10.1108/978-1-80262-897-520241005.

Mahmud, A. (2024) ‘Exploring the experiences of Muslim doctoral students in UK higher education: challenges, implications, and pathways to inclusivity’, *Studies in Higher Education*, 50(4), pp. 848–863. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2024.2357718.

Masutha, M., Rajani, N. and and Enders, J. (2024) ‘Challenging university complicity and majoritarian narratives: counter-storytelling from black working-class students’, *Critical Studies in Education*, 65(1), pp. 20–38. doi: 10.1080/17508487.2023.2209125.

Mbutho, N. P. and Hutchings, C. (2021) ‘The Complex Concept of Plagiarism: Undergraduate and Postgraduate Student Perspectives’, *Perspectives in education*, 39(2), pp. 67–81. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v39.i2.6.

McGregor, A. et al. (2022) ‘Supporting International Students in an Ontario College: A Case for Multiple Interventions’, *Canadian Journal of Action Research*, 22(2), p. 5.

McKenna, S. (2022) ‘Plagiarism and the commodification of knowledge’, *Higher education*, 84(6), pp. 1283–1298. doi: 10.1007/s10734-022-00926-5.

Meghji, A. (2020) ‘Towards a theoretical synergy: Critical race theory and decolonial thought in Trumpamerica and Brexit Britain’, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392120969764>, 70(5), pp. 647–664. doi: 10.1177/0011392120969764.

Meghji, A. (2022) ‘Towards a theoretical synergy: Critical race theory and decolonial thought in Trumpamerica and Brexit Britain’, *Current sociology*, 70(5), pp. 647–664. doi: 10.1177/0011392120969764.

Mei Hu (2024) ‘International Students’ Feeling of Shame in the Higher Education: An Intersectional Analysis of Their Racialised, Gendered and Classed Experiences in the UK Universities’, *Sociology Study*, 14(1). doi: 10.17265/2159-5526/2024.01.006.

Mejía, A. and Garcés-Flórez, M. F. (2025) ‘What do we mean by academic integrity?’, *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 21(1), pp. 1–20. doi: 10.1007/s40979-024-00176-1.

Memon, A. R. and Jivraj, S. (2024) ‘Trust, courage and silence: carving out decolonial spaces in higher education through student–staff partnerships’, in Adebisi, F. I. (ed.) *Decolonisation and the Law School*. London: Routledge, pp. 7–20. doi: 10.4324/9781003481324.

Mercer, J. (2007) ‘The challenges of insider research in educational institutions’, *Oxford review of education*, 33(1), pp. 1–17. doi: 10.1080/03054980601094651.

Mignolo, W. D. (2011) *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Duke University Press. doi: 10.2307/j.ctv125jgbw.

Mills, C. W. (1997) *The Racial Contract*. Cornell University Press. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/stable/10.7591/j.ctt5hh1wj>.

Mittelmeier, J. et al. (2023) ‘Mapping the Subfield of Existing Research With International Students’, *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 21–32. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-4.

Mongia, P. (ed.) (2021) *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory*. 1st edn. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. Available at: <https://ereader.perlego.com/1/book/2094470/0>.

Montgomery, C. (2023) ‘RE-CENTRING CONSTRUCTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN WRITING: The “empire writes back”’, *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 266–273. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-32.

Moosavi, L. (2020) ‘The decolonial bandwagon and the dangers of intellectual decolonisation’, *International Review of Sociology*, 30(2), pp. 332–354. doi: 10.1080/03906701.2020.1776919.

Moosavi, L. (2022) ‘The myth of academic tolerance: the stigmatisation of East Asian students in Western higher education’, *Asian Ethnicity*, 23(3), pp. 484–503. doi: 10.1080/14631369.2021.1882289.

Mukasa, J., Stokes, L. and Mukona, D. M. (2023) ‘Academic dishonesty by students of bioethics at a tertiary institution in Australia: an exploratory study’, *International journal for educational integrity*, 19(1), pp. 1–15. doi: 10.1007/s40979-023-00124-5.

Myer, L. and Smith, A. W. (2024) ‘Academic Integrity in the United Kingdom: The Quality Assurance Agency’s National Approach BT - Second Handbook of Academic Integrity’, in Eaton, S. E. (ed.). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, pp. 841–858. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5\_173.

Nada, C. (2023) ‘REFLECTING ON INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS’ VOICES AND EXPERIENCES IN QUALITATIVE DATA: A narrative approach’, *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 235–243. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-29.

Ogle, G. E. (2003) ““The Eternal Power of Reason” and “The Superiority of Whites”: Hilliard d’Auberteuil’s Colonial Enlightenment”, *French colonial history*, 3, pp. 35–50. doi: 10.1353/fch.2003.0010.

OIAHE (2025) *Case summaries* - OIAHE. Available at: <https://www.oliahe.org.uk/resources-and-publications/case-summaries/?searchTerm=cs0725&sort=desc> (Accessed: 26 September 2025).

Oji, J. and Ochuko, C. (2024) ‘Navigating Ethical Quandaries in Nigerian Academia:

A Conceptual Framework for Establishing Effective Research Ethics Boards and Ensuring Compliance', *NIU Journal of Educational Research*, 10(1). doi: 10.58709/niujed.v10i1.1939.

Okello, W. K. (2023) 'EPISTEMIC ASPHYXIATION: Whiteness, Academic Publishing, and the Suffocation of Black Knowledge Production', *Critical Whiteness Praxis in Higher Education: Considerations for the Pursuit of Racial Justice on Campus*, pp. 115–134. doi: 10.4324/9781003443919-8/EPISTEMIC-ASPHYXIATION-WILSON-KWAMOGI-OKELLO.

Oliver, P. (2010) *The Student's Guide to Research Ethics*. Second. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

ONS (2025) 'Reason for international migration, international students update: November 2024', (May), pp. 1–15. Available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/internationalmigration/articles/reasonforinternationalmigrationinternationalstudentsupdate/november2024#:~:text=1.-,Main%20points,ago> (YE June 2019).

Owusu-Kwarteng, L. (2021) "Studying in this England is wahala (trouble)": analysing the experiences of West African students in a UK higher education institution', *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(11), pp. 2405–2416. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2020.1723528.

Oxford Brookes University (2024) *Academic integrity - Oxford Brookes University*. Available at: <https://www.brookes.ac.uk/students/academic-development/online-resources/academic-integrity> (Accessed: 21 July 2024).

Oyinloye, B and Zhang, B. (2023) 'A decolonial praxis for research with international students'. Routledge. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003290803-27>.

Oyinloye, Bukola and Zhang, B. (2023) 'A DECOLONIAL PRAXIS FOR RESEARCH WITH INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS', in *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*. Taylor and Francis, pp. 216–225. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-27/DECOLONIAL-PRAXIS-RESEARCH-INTERNATIONAL-STUDENTS-BUKOLA-OYINLOYE-BOWEN-ZHANG.

Page, C. (2022) 'Linguistic Racism, Deficit Constructions, and the Othering of International Students', in Cho, C. L. and Corkett, J. K. (eds) *Global Perspectives on Microaggressions in Higher Education*. 1st edn. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 26–44.

Parnther, C. (2022) 'International Students and Academic Misconduct: Considering Culture, Community, and Context', *Journal of college and character*, 23(1), pp. 60–75. doi: 10.1080/2194587X.2021.2017978.

Patton, L. D. (2016) 'Disrupting Postsecondary Prose: Toward a Critical Race Theory of Higher Education', *Urban Education*, 51(3), pp. 315–342. doi: 10.1177/0042085915602542.

Perkins, M. and Roe, J. (2024) 'Decoding Academic Integrity Policies: A Corpus Linguistics Investigation of AI and Other Technological Threats', *Higher Education Policy*, 37(3), pp. 633–653. doi: 10.1057/s41307-023-00323-2.

Pham, V. N. (2023) 'Truth as White property: solidifying White epistemology and owning racial knowledge', *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 20(2), pp. 288–305. doi: 10.1080/14791420.2023.2199831.

Ploner, J. (2023) 'Developing Complex Narratives About International Students', *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 87–95. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-12.

Ploner, J. and Nada, C. (2020a) 'International student migration and the postcolonial heritage of European higher education: perspectives from Portugal and the UK', *Higher*

*Education*, 80(2), pp. 373–389. doi: 10.1007/s10734-019-00485-2.

Ploner, J. and Nada, C. (2020b) ‘International student migration and the postcolonial heritage of European higher education: perspectives from Portugal and the UK’, *Higher education*, 80(2), pp. 373–389. doi: 10.1007/s10734-019-00485-2.

QAA (2024) *Academic Integrity Charter for UK Higher Education, The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education*. Available at: <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/membership/membership-areas-of-work/academic-integrity/charter> (Accessed: 1 November 2024).

QAA (2025) *The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education*. Available at: <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/> (Accessed: 23 September 2025).

Queen Mary University (2022) ‘Academic Misconduct Policy’, pp. 1–9. Available at: [https://www.qmul.ac.uk/governance-and-legal-services/media/arcs/policyzone/academic/Academic-Misconduct-Policy-\(2023-24\).pdf](https://www.qmul.ac.uk/governance-and-legal-services/media/arcs/policyzone/academic/Academic-Misconduct-Policy-(2023-24).pdf).

Quijano, A. (2000) ‘Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America’, *International Sociology*, 15(2), pp. 215–232.

R’boul, H. (2022) ‘Postcolonial interventions in intercultural communication knowledge: Meta-intercultural ontologies, decolonial knowledges and epistemological polylogue’, *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 15(1), pp. 75–93. doi: 10.1080/17513057.2020.1829676.

Ramjattan, V. A. (2023) ‘INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND LANGUAGE: From individual “deficiency” to instrument of oppression’, *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 174–182. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-22/INTERNATIONAL-STUDENTS-LANGUAGE-VIJAY-RAMJATTAN.

Rizvi, S. (2022) ‘Racially-just epistemologies and methodologies that disrupt whiteness’, *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 45(3), pp. 225–231. doi: 10.1080/1743727X.2022.2073141.

Roe, J. (2023) ‘Discursive Construction of Contract Cheating and Degradation of Higher Education: Comments on The Daily Mail Online’, *Forum, qualitative social research*, 24(2), pp. 1–20. doi: 10.17169/fqs-24.2.4000.

Rowsell, J. (2025) *Five UK universities tell staff they can’t afford pay rises*, *Times Higher Education*. Available at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/five-uk-universities-tell-staff-they-cant-afford-pay-rises> (Accessed: 7 October 2025).

Rutakumwa, R. *et al.* (2020) ‘Conducting in-depth interviews with and without voice recorders: a comparative analysis’, *Qualitative Research*, 20(5), pp. 565–581. doi: 10.1177/1468794119884806;CTYPE:STRING:JOURNAL.

Said, E. W. (2003) *Orientalism*. [25th anniversary... New York: Vintage Books, a division of Random House.

Sanni-Anibire, H. *et al.* (2021) ‘International students’ knowledge and emotions related to academic integrity at Canadian postsecondary institutions’. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00088-4.

Saunders, M. N. K. and Rojon, C. (2011) ‘On the attributes of a critical literature review’, *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 4(2), pp. 156–162. doi: 10.1080/17521882.2011.596485.

Savas, G. (2014) ‘Understanding critical race theory as a framework in higher educational research’, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 35(4), pp. 506–522. doi: 10.1080/01425692.2013.777211.

Sbaffi, L. and Zhao, X. (2022) ‘Evaluating a pedagogical approach to promoting academic integrity in higher education: An online induction program’, *Frontiers in*

*psychology*, 13, pp. 1009305–1009305. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1009305.

Scott, P. (1993) ‘The idea of the university in the 21st century: A British perspective’, *British journal of educational studies*, 41(1), pp. 4–25. doi: 10.1080/00071005.1993.9973945.

Sefcik, L., Striepe, M. and Yorke, J. (2020) ‘Mapping the landscape of academic integrity education programs: what approaches are effective?’, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(1), pp. 30–43. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2019.1604942.

Shakun, N. *et al.* (2024) ‘Postcolonial perspectives in the 21st Century: a critical analysis of modern theories and methodologies’, *Revista Amazonia Investiga*, 13(78), pp. 194–208. doi: 10.34069/ai/2024.78.06.16.

Sharpe, M. (2019) ‘From Amy Allen to Abbé Raynal: Critical Theory, the Enlightenment and Colonialism’, *Critical Horizons*, 9917. doi: 10.1080/14409917.2019.1596220.

Shimomura, F. (2024) ‘The voice of the Other in a “liberal” ivory tower: exploring the counterstory of an Asian international student on structural racism in US academia’, *Whiteness and Education*, 9(1), pp. 161–176. doi: 10.1080/23793406.2023.2198536.

Shore, C. and Wright, S. (2011) ‘Introduction: Conceptualising policy: Technologies of governance and the politics of visibility’, *Policy Worlds: Anthropology and the Analysis of Contemporary Power*, (April 2011), pp. 1–26.

Shoyukhi, M. *et al.* (2023) ‘Developing a comprehensive plagiarism assessment rubric’, *Education and information technologies*, 28(5), pp. 5893–5919. doi: 10.1007/s10639-022-11365-1.

Sikka, T. and Proctor, H. (2024) ‘Epistemic injustice, university bordering regimes and international postgraduate researchers’, *Journal of Digital Social Research*, 6(3), pp. 25–39. doi: 10.33621/JDSR.V6I3.33241.

Smolík, J. and Herbočková, L. (2021) ‘ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS AT THE FACULTY OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES TOWARD PLAGIARISM’, *HUMAN AFFAIRS*, 31, pp. 46–58. doi: 10.1515/humaff-2021-0005.

Snyder, H. (2019) ‘Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines’, *Journal of Business Research*, 104, pp. 333–339. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039.

Solorzano, D., Ceja, M. and Yosso, T. (2000) ‘Critical Race Theory, Racial Microaggressions, and Campus Racial Climate: The Experiences of African American College Students’, *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), pp. 60–73. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696265%5Cnhttp://about.jstor.org/terms>.

Solórzano, D. G. and Yosso, T. J. (2002) ‘Critical Race Methodology: Counter-Storytelling as an Analytical Framework for Education Research’, *Qualitative inquiry*, 8(1), pp. 23–44. doi: 10.1177/107780040200800103.

Soorenian, A. (2023) ‘Intersectional Issues in Research With Disabled International Students’, *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 107–115. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-14.

Spivak, G. (1988) ‘Can the subaltern speak?’, *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* London:, pp. 24–28.

Spivak, G. C. (1990) *The post-colonial critic : interviews, strategies, dialogues*. Edited by S. Harasym. New York ; Routledge.

Spivak, G. C. (1999) *A critique of postcolonial reason : toward a history of the vanishing present*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Stoesz, B. M. and Eaton, S. E. (2022) ‘Academic Integrity Policies of Publicly Funded

Universities in Western Canada', *Educational Policy*, 36(6), pp. 1529–1548. doi: 10.1177/0895904820983032.

Stone, A. (2023) 'Student Perceptions of Academic Integrity: A Qualitative Study of Understanding, Consequences, and Impact', *Journal of academic ethics*, 21(3), pp. 357–375. doi: 10.1007/s10805-022-09461-5.

Strachan, R., Oguna, C. and Oruche, U. (2024) 'The Postgraduate Student Perspective on Academic Misconduct in the Era of Essay Mills and Generative AI: A Case Study from Northeast England', in *2024 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON)*. IEEE, pp. 1–7. doi: 10.1109/EDUCON60312.2024.10578821.

Swansea University (no date) *Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct - Swansea University*. Available at: <https://myuni.swansea.ac.uk/academic-life/academic-misconduct/> (Accessed: 3 November 2024).

Sweeney, S. (2023) 'Who wrote this? Essay mills and assessment – Considerations regarding contract cheating and AI in higher education', *International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2). doi: 10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100818.

Tan, E. and Carnegie, S. (2022) "It's not plagiarism, it's a bad use of power phrasing": Assessment of home and international student (mis)understandings of citation practice', *Innovations in education and teaching international*, 59(3), pp. 285–295. doi: 10.1080/14703297.2020.1844779.

Tavares, V. (2024) 'Feeling excluded: international students experience equity, diversity and inclusion', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 28(8), pp. 1551–1568. doi: 10.1080/13603116.2021.2008536.

Temple, Bogusia (2008) 'Narrative analysis of written texts: reflexivity in cross language research', *Qualitative Research*, 8(3), pp. 355–365. doi: 10.1177/1468794106093632.

Thomas, C. (2000) 'Critical Race Theory and Postcolonial Development Theory: Observations on Methodology', *Villanova Law Review*, 45. Available at: <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/vllalr45&id=1211&div=&collection=> (Accessed: 22 September 2025).

Torres, R. et al. (2025) "They Just Want Our Faces, But They Don't Want Our Experiences": Amplifying Black Doctoral Student Voice Through Counter-Storytelling', *Educational Studies - AESA*, 61(1), pp. 72–93. doi: 10.1080/00131946.2025.2477055.

Tran, M. N., Hogg, L. and Marshall, S. (2022) 'Understanding postgraduate students' perceptions of plagiarism: a case study of Vietnamese and local students in New Zealand', *International journal for educational integrity*, 18(1), pp. 1–21. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00098-2.

Tsenongu, C. T., Okwu, E. and Obande, B. O. (2024) *Fighting the Monster Plagiarism among Postgraduate Students in Higher Educational Institutions in Nigeria ARTICLE INFO, Educational Institutions in Nigeria. OMANARP INTER. J. Lib & Info Science*.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2022) *Decolonising Methodologies*. Third. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Turin, T. et al. (2016) *Conducting a Literature Review in Health Research: Basics of the Approach, Typology and Methodology Corresponding Author, JNHFB*. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335951222>.

Udah, H. (2023) 'COLONIALITY OF POWER AND RESEARCH WITH INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS', *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 64–73. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-9/COLONIALITY-POWER-RESEARCH-INTERNATIONAL-STUDENTS-HYACINTH-UDAH.

Universities UK (2024) *Higher education in facts and figures: 2023*, Universities UK. Available at: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/what-we-do/policy-and-research/publications/features/higher-education-facts-and-figures-2023> (Accessed: 14 June 2025).

Universities UK (2025a) *International facts and figures 2023*, Universities UK. Available at: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/universities-uk-international/insights-and-publications/uuki-publications/international-facts-and-figures-2023> (Accessed: 26 September 2025).

Universities UK (2025b) *Universities grip financial crisis – but at what cost to the nation?*, Universities UK. Available at: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/what-we-do/creating-voice-our-members/media-releases/universities-grip-financial-crisis-what> (Accessed: 7 October 2025).

University Alliance (no date) *University Alliance Members – University Alliance*. Available at: <https://www.unialliance.ac.uk/> (Accessed: 14 June 2025).

University of Cambridge (2025) *Why does academic integrity matter? | Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct*. Available at: <https://www.plagiarism.admin.cam.ac.uk/what-academic-misconduct/why-does-academic-integrity-matter> (Accessed: 25 April 2025).

Unkule, K. (2023) 'CONCEPTUALISING TO TRANSCEND: Glocal imaginaries and international students', *Research with International Students: Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations*, pp. 147–154. doi: 10.4324/9781003290803-19.

UWTSD (2022) *Academic Misconduct Policy*. Available at: chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.uwtsd.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2024-01/Academic\_Misconduct\_Policy\_2022-23.pdf.

Vaccino-Salvadore, S. and Buck, R. H. (2021) 'Moving from plagiarism police to integrity coaches: assisting novice students in understanding the relationship between research and ownership'. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00085-7.

Valencia, R. R. (2010) *Dismantling Contemporary Deficit Thinking: Educational Thought and Practice*. New York: Routledge.

Valencia, R. R. and Solorzano, D. G. (2012) 'Contemporary deficit thinking', *The Evolution of Deficit Thinking: Educational Thought and Practice*, pp. 160–210. doi: 10.4324/9780203046586-12.

Weale, S. (2023) *Universities rebuked over academic misconduct cases in England and Wales | Universities | The Guardian*, The Guardian. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2023/feb/27/universities-rebuked-over-academic-misconduct-cases-in-england-and-wales> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).

Workman, A. (2024) 'Critical Whiteness in Academia', in Ravulo, J. et al. (eds) *Handbook of Critical Whiteness: Deconstructing Dominant Discourses Across Disciplines*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, pp. 93–97. doi: 10.1007/978-981-97-5085-6\_105.

Yin, P. (2024) 'The coloniality of internationalization: towards a power-conscious framework for studying the experiences of international students in Western contexts', *Studies in Higher Education*, pp. 1–16. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2024.2407940.

Young, L. (2024) *New and emerging plagiarism trends explained*, Turnitin. Available at: <https://www.turnitin.com/blog/what-are-the-new-and-emerging-trends-in-academic-misconduct> (Accessed: 24 September 2025).

Zembylas, M. (2025) 'On the entanglement of epistemic violence and affective injustice in higher education: a conceptual analysis', *Higher Education*, 89(3), pp. 791–805. doi: 10.1007/s10734-024-01247-5.

Zhuang, L. and Bell, K. (2024) 'Improving the Learning Experience of Chinese Masters' students in UK higher education', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*,

48(6), pp. 625–637. doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2024.2379955.

## 9. APPENDICES

### a. Ethics Form



PG2 / E1 FORM

### APPLICATION FOR ETHICAL APPROVAL

#### RESEARCH STUDENTS

This form is to be completed by the student within **SIX** months for full-time students and **TWELVE** months for part time students, after the commencement of the research degree or following progression to Part Two of your course.

Once complete, submit this form via the **MyTSD Doctoral College Portal** at (<https://mytsd.uwtsd.ac.uk>).

This document is also available in Welsh.

#### RESEARCH STAFF ONLY

All communications relating to this application during its processing must be in writing and emailed to [pgresearch@uwtsd.ac.uk](mailto:pgresearch@uwtsd.ac.uk) , with the title 'Ethical Approval' followed by your name.

**STUDENTS ON UNDERGRADUATE OR TAUGHT MASTERS PROGRAMMES**

should submit this form (and receive the outcome) via systems explained to you by the supervisor/module leader.

**In order for research to result in benefit and minimise risk of harm, it must be conducted ethically. A researcher may not be covered by the University's insurance if ethical approval has not been obtained prior to commencement.**

The University follows the OECD Frascati manual definition of **research activity**: "creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man, culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications". As such this covers activities undertaken by members of staff, postgraduate research students, and both taught postgraduate and undergraduate students working on dissertations/projects.

The individual undertaking the research activity is known as the "principal researcher".

Ethical approval is not required for routine audits, performance reviews, quality assurance studies, testing within normal educational requirements, and literary or artistic criticism.

**Please read the notes for guidance before completing ALL sections of the form.**

**This form must be completed and approved prior to undertaking any research activity.** Please see Checklist for details of process for different categories of application.

**SECTION A: About You (Principal Researcher)**

1	Full Name:		Laura Martin-Simpson			
2	Tick all boxes that apply:		Member of staff:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Honorary research fellow:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Undergraduate Student	<input type="checkbox"/>	Taught Postgraduate Student	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Postgraduate Research Student	<input type="checkbox"/>

3	Institute/Academic Discipline/Centre:		Humanities and Social Sciences				
4	Campus:		Carmarthen				
5	E-mail address:		2009552@student.uwtsd.ac.uk				
6	Contact Number:	Telephone					
	<b>For students:</b>						
7	Student Number:		2009552				
8	Programme of Study:		MA Equity and Diversity in Society				
9	Director of Studies/Supervisor:		Jessica Pitman				

## SECTION B: Approval for Research Activity

1	Has the research activity received approval in principle?  (please check the Guidance Notes as to the appropriate approval process for different levels of research by different categories of individual)	YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
				<b>Date</b>	
2	If Yes, please indicate source of approval (and date where known):  <b>Approval in principle must be obtained from the relevant source prior to seeking ethical approval</b>	Research Degrees Committee	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Institute Research Committee	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Other (write in) MA EDS Supervisor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21/01/25	

## SECTION C: Internal and External Ethical Guidance Materials

	Please list the core ethical guidance documents that have been referred to during the completion of this form (including any discipline-specific codes of research ethics, location-specific codes of research ethics, and also any specific ethical guidance relating to the proposed methodology). Please tick to confirm that your research proposal adheres to these codes and guidelines. You may add rows to this table if needed.	
1	<a href="#"><u>UWTSD Research Ethics &amp; Integrity Code of Practice</u></a>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<a href="#"><u>UWTSD Research Data Management Policy</u></a>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3	<b>British Sociological Association Ethical Guidelines</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	-------------------------------------

#### **SECTION D: External Collaborative Research Activity**

If there are external collaborators then you should gain consent from the contact persons to share their personal data with the university. If there are no external collaborators then leave this section blank and continue to section E.

1	Institution					
2	Contact person name					
3	Contact person e-mail address					
4	Is your research externally funded?	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5	Are you in receipt of a KESS scholarship?	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6	Are you specifically employed to undertake this research in either a paid or voluntary capacity?	Voluntary	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
7		Employed	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Is the research being undertaken within an existing UWTSD Athrofa Professional Learning Partnership (APLP)?	If YES then the permission question below does not need to be answered.	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

9	Has permission to undertake the research has been provided by the partner organisation?	(If YES attach copy) If NO the application cannot continue	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	---	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

**Where research activity is carried out in collaboration with an external organisation**

10	Does this organisation have its own ethics approval system?	YES	<input type="checkbox"/>	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>
	If Yes, please attach a copy of any final approval (or interim approval) from the organisation (this may be a copy of an email if appropriate).				

**SECTION E: Details of Research Activity**

1	Indicative title:	Academic Integrity: Perceptions and Experiences of Postgraduate Global South International Students Studying in the UK		
2	Proposed start date:	March 2025	Proposed end date:	29/09/25
	<p><b>Introduction to the Research (maximum 300 words per section)</b></p> <p>Ensure that you write for a <u>Non-Specialist Audience</u> when outlining your response to the points below:</p> <p><i>Purpose of Research Activity</i> <i>Proposed Research Question</i></p>			

	<p><i>Aims of Research Activity</i>  <i>Objectives of Research Activity</i></p> <p>Demonstrate, briefly, how <b>Existing Research</b> has informed the proposed activity and explain</p> <p><i>What the research activity will add to the body of knowledge</i>  <i>How it addresses an area of importance.</i></p>
3	<p><b>Purpose of Research Activity</b></p> <p>Academic integrity can be understood as a code of practice within academia consisting of culturally normative values, practices and processes to ensure quality assurance (Barnett, 1994). All members of the academic community, both professional academics and university students alike, are expected to adhere to the academic integrity code of practice. There is no singular, UK nor international, definition of academic integrity (Eaton, 2024, p. 3). However, Bretag and Mahmud (2016) contend all definitions of academic integrity are underpinned by the key culturally normative values; honesty, truth, validity, respect, fairness, trust, and responsibility.</p> <p>Mbutho and Hutchings (2021) find that the global phenomenon of global south international students' disproportional representation in academic misconduct cases throughout Western higher education establishments has been a field of research for over twenty years. Despite this, the phenomenon persists as an evolving contemporary concern for both universities and global south international students (Birks <i>et al.</i>, 2020; Vaccino-Salvadore and Buck, 2021). Eaton (2022) argues the pattern of</p>

	<p>findings evidencing Black and Ethnically Marginalised (BEM) international students being more likely to be accused and reported for academic misconduct must be acted upon (McGregor <i>et al.</i>, 2022; Jisc, 2023).</p> <p>Conducting a systemic literature review of UK higher education pedagogic practices involving international students, Lomer and Mittelmeier (2023) find multiple articles use homogenous categorisations of 'international students' often through a binary lens with 'home students'. This homogenisation is argued to perpetuate the discursive process of 'othering' (Spivak, 1988; Said, 2003; Ciccarello-Maher, 2021; Fanon, 2021). Literature from within the UK correspondingly finds international students' confined within a binary ethical value system and sustained punitive discourses (Birks <i>et al.</i>, 2020; Roe, 2023; Stone, 2023; Sweeney, 2023). Lomer and Mittelmeier (2023) further critique that the dominant practice of homogenising international students within research, results in 'lack of conceptual clarity'. Tran, Hogg and Marshall, (2022, p. 8) further this by calling for research dedicated to the experiences of international post-graduate students. To mitigate against further pathology and perpetuation of hegemonic academic discourses, this dissertation will focus on a critical literature review of the experiences and perceptions of academic integrity for Nigerian international Masters students who have studied in the UK and Wales.</p> <p>(this box should expand as you type)</p>
4	<b>Research Question</b>

	<p>How do postgraduate Global South international students studying in the UK <del>and Wales</del> perceive and experience academic integrity? <del>and what could be the specific perceptions and experiences of Nigerian postgraduate international students within this context?</del></p> <p>(this box should expand as you type)</p>
5	<p><b>Aims of Research Activity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To identify the perceptions and experiences of postgraduate international students regarding academic integrity within the context of UK <del>and Welsh</del> higher education system.</li> <li>• <del>To explore how specifically Nigerian postgraduate students may perceive and experience academic integrity within the context of UK and Welsh higher education system</del></li> <li>• To investigate whether UK <del>and Wales</del> academic integrity processes may pose barriers to the learning experience of post graduate international students.</li> </ul> <p>(this box should expand as you type)</p>
6	<p><b>Objectives of Research Activity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To critically conduct a comparative analysis of relevant and significant current literature that explores the perceptions and experiences of Global South international postgraduate students who have studied in the UK <del>and Wales</del>.</li> <li>• <del>To undertake a case study to explore how Nigerian postgraduates could perceive and experience academic integrity within the UK and Wales.</del></li> <li>• <del>To critically compare academic integrity concepts and practices between the UK and Nigerian educational systems.</del></li> <li>• To conduct a short comparative critical content analysis of academic integrity policy documents from three different universities.</li> <li>• To identify gaps in current literature and provide recommendations for future research.</li> </ul>

	(this box should expand as you type)
	<p><b>Proposed methods (maximum 600 words)</b></p> <p>Provide a brief summary of all the methods that <b>may</b> be used in the research activity, making it clear what specific techniques may be used. If methods other than those listed in this section are deemed appropriate later, additional ethical approval for those methods will be needed. You do not need to justify the methods here, but should instead describe how you intend to collect the data necessary for you to complete your project.</p>
7	<p>This dissertation will conduct a critical review of current literature that explores how postgraduate Global South international students studying in the UK and Wales perceive and experience academic integrity; and what could be the specific perceptions and experiences of Nigerian postgraduate international student within this context. For this dissertation a critical literature review is defined as, 'not just a summary of the literature; rather, it demonstrates extensive research and quality evaluation. Authors of critical reviews do not need to mention every single element from the source literature but instead extract the most important ideas from the sources. Generally, the findings of critical reviews are typically hypotheses or models.' (Turin <i>et al.</i>, 2016, p. 48). As argued by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2017, p. 52), conducting a critical literature review within educational research means examining the relationship between education and society; analysing the social construction of knowledge and the production and reproduction of power through epistemological dominance.</p>

This critical review will analyse literature through two theoretical lenses: Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Postcolonial Theory. Though these two theories have different focuses, CRT on contemporary racial inequality and postcolonialism on the inequitable aftermath of historical colonialism, Meghji, (2022) argues for a theoretical synergy between the two in sociological research analysis. This is of particular importance to this critical review as it allows the analysis of both the current racialised educational-social systems and Western epistemic power relations that Global South postgraduate international students may experience in the academic communities of UK universities.

This critical review will first conduct a comparative analysis of relevant and significant current qualitative literature that explores the perceptions and experiences of Global South international postgraduate students who have studied in the UK and Wales. Comparative analysis will also be undertaken between UK findings and literature within other Western countries that have a large number of Global South international postgraduate students and are dominant in literature publication within this field including Australia, New Zealand and Canada.

A short content analysis will then be conducted on three academic integrity policies from three separate universities to investigate whether UK and Wales academic integrity processes may pose barriers to equitable learning experiences of post graduate Global South

	<p>international students. The three institutions will all be members of the same group of universities and will be geographically diverse: Wales, North of England and South of England.</p> <p><del>A case study will then be undertaken to explore how specifically Nigerian postgraduate students may perceive and experience academic integrity within the context of the UK and Welsh higher education systems. Nigerian students make up a considerable amount of Global South students choosing to study in the UK. Between the academic years of 2018/19 and 2022/23 there was a 900% (48,000) increase of Nigerian students studying in UK HEIs, resulting in Nigeria being the third top country of origin for Global South students, below China and India (Bolton, Lewis and Gower, 2024, p. 15).</del></p> <p>(this box should expand as you type)</p>
	<p><b>Location of research activity</b></p> <p>Identify all locations where research activity will take place.</p>
8	<p>N/A as a Literature Review</p> <p>(this box should expand as you type)</p>
	<p><b>Research activity outside of the UK</b></p>

	<p>If research activity will take place overseas, you are responsible for ensuring that local ethical considerations are complied with and that the relevant permissions are sought. Specify any local guidelines (e.g. from local professional associations/learned societies/universities) that exist and whether these involve any ethical stipulations beyond those usual in the UK (provide details of any licenses or permissions required). Also specify whether there are any specific ethical issues raised by the local context in which the research activity is taking place, for example, particular cultural and/or legal sensitivities or vulnerabilities of participants. If you live in the country where you will do the research then please state this.</p>
9	<p>N/A</p> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>

10	<p>Use of documentation not in the public domain: Are any documents <b>NOT</b> publicly available?</p>	<b>NO</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		<b>YES</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	<p>If Yes, please provide details here of how you will gain access to specific documentation that is not in the public domain and that this is in accordance with the current data protection law of the country in question and that of England and Wales.</p> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>		

	<b>Does your research relate to one or more of the seven aims of the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015?</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
12	A prosperous Wales	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13	A resilient Wales	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14	A healthier Wales	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	A more equal Wales	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	A Wales of cohesive communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
17	A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18	A globally responsible Wales	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19	If YES to any of the above, please give details:		
	<p>A healthier Wales:</p> <p>Tindall <i>et al.</i>, (2021) and Holliman <i>et al.</i>, (2023) found international students experience loneliness, cultural shock and decreased mental and physical health all of which are further impacted by accusations of academic misconduct. This research will support 'A compassionate nation: Support people to act with compassion, to facilitate understanding of mental well-being' (Welsh Government, 2018, p. 1).</p> <p>A more equal Wales:</p> <p>Current research in this field of enquiry has found inequitable and discriminatory practice towards international students by not providing proactive inclusive teaching to support understanding of academic integrity (Ploner and Nada, 2020; Smolík and Herbočková, 2021). This</p>		

	<p>research will support, "A society that enables people to fulfil their potential no matter what their background or circumstances (including their socio economic background and circumstances)." (Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, no date b, p. 2)</p> <p>A globally responsible Wales:</p> <p>Future Generations Commissioner for Wales (no date, p. 6) states that to enable a globally responsive Wales, there must be an understanding 'that diversity unites communities rather than divides them.' This research will support the understanding of differing educational and cultural backgrounds of those studying and living in this country; seeking to explore equitable practice through decolonisation of academic practice (Eaton and Christensen Hughes, 2022)</p> <p>(this box should expand as you type)</p>

## SECTION F: Scope of Research Activity

	Will the research activity include:	YES	NO
1	Use of a questionnaire or similar research instrument?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	Use of interviews?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	Use of focus groups?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

If NO to every question, then the research activity is (ethically) low risk and **may** be exempt from **some** of the following sections (please refer to Guidance Notes).

If YES to any question, then no research activity should be undertaken until full ethical approval has been obtained.

### **SECTION G: Intended Participants**

If there are no participants then do not complete this section, but go directly to section H.

	<b>Who are the intended participants:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
1	Students or staff at the University?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Adults (over the age of 18 and competent to give consent)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Vulnerable adults?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Children and Young People under the age of 18? (Consent from Parent, Carer or Guardian will be required)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Prisoners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Young offenders?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Those who could be considered to have a particularly dependent relationship with the investigator or a gatekeeper?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	People engaged in illegal activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Others. Please indicate the participants below, and specifically any group who may be unable to give consent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Details of any other participant groups:		

	(this box should expand as you type)		
--	--------------------------------------	--	--

	<b>Participant numbers and source</b>		
	Provide an estimate of the expected number of participants. How will you identify participants and how will they be recruited?		
10	How many participants are expected?	(this box should expand as you type)	
11	Who will the participants be?	(this box should expand as you type)	
12	How will you identify the participants?	(this box should expand as you type)	

	<b>Information for participants:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
13	Will you describe the main research procedures to participants in advance, so that they are informed about what to expect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Will you tell participants that their participation is voluntary?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15	Will you obtain written consent for participation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	Will you explain to participants that refusal to participate in the research will not affect their treatment or education (if relevant)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17	If the research is observational, will you ask participants for their consent to being observed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18	Will you tell participants that they may withdraw from the research at any time and for any reason?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19	With questionnaires, will you give participants the option of omitting questions they do not want to answer?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20	Will you tell participants that their data will be treated with full confidentiality and that, if published, it will not be identifiable as theirs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21	Will you debrief participants at the end of their participation, in a way appropriate to the type of research undertaken?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22	If NO to any of above questions, please give an explanation			
	(this box should expand as you type)			

	<b>Information for participants:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
24	Will participants be paid?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25	Is specialist electrical or other equipment to be used with participants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

26	Are there any financial or other interests to the investigator or University arising from this study?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27	Will the research activity involve deliberately misleading participants in any way, or the partial or full concealment of the specific study aims?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28	If YES to any question, please provide full details			
	<p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>			

#### **SECTION H: Anticipated Risks**

	<p><b>10.</b></p> <p><b>11. Outline any anticipated risks that may adversely affect any of the participants, the researchers and/or the University, and the steps that will be taken to address them.</b></p> <p>If you have completed a full risk assessment (for example as required by a laboratory, or external research collaborator) you may append that to this form.</p>		
<p><b>12.</b></p> <p>1</p>	<p><b>13. Full risk assessment completed and appended?</b></p>	<p><b>14. Yes</b></p>	<p><b>15.</b> <input type="checkbox"/></p>
		<p><b>16. No</b></p>	<p><b>17.</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>2</p>	<p><b>Risks to participants</b></p> <p>For example: sector-specific health &amp; safety, emotional distress, financial disclosure, physical harm, transfer of personal data, sensitive organisational information</p>		
	<p>Risk to participants:</p>	<p><i>How you will mitigate the risk to participants:</i></p>	

	<p>N/A as a literature review</p> <p>N/A as a literature review <i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p> <p>(this box should expand as you type)</p>	N/A as a literature review <i>(this box should expand as you type)</i>
3	If research activity may include sensitive, embarrassing or upsetting topics (e.g. sexual activity, drug use) or issues likely to disclose information requiring further action (e.g. criminal activity), give details of the procedures to deal with these issues, including any support/advice (e.g. helpline numbers) to be offered to participants. Note that where applicable, consent procedures should make it clear that if something potentially or actually illegal is discovered in the course of a project, it may need to be disclosed to the proper authorities	
	N/A <i>(this box should expand as you type)</i>	
4	<p><b>Risks to the investigator</b></p> <p>For example: personal health &amp; safety, physical harm, emotional distress, risk of accusation of harm/impropriety, conflict of interest</p>	
	<p>Risk to the investigator:</p> <p>Traditional literature</p>	<p><i>How you will mitigate the risk to the investigator:</i></p> <p>Using CASP UK (2025) critical appraisal checklist for systemic literature reviews to</p>

	<p>reviews may lack thoroughness and rigor being conducted ad hoc, rather than following a specific methodology which can put the credibility of the research in jeopardy (Snyder, 2019)</p> <p>Suri (2020, p. 46) states, 'A number of researchers in education and health sciences have found that studies with certain methodological</p>	<p>ensure consistent critical thinking of each source.</p> <p>In designing an appropriate sampling and search strategy, reviewers should carefully consider the impact of potential publication biases and search biases. By critically analysing the research, its funders and purpose of the research the researcher may highlight funding bias, methodological bias, confirmatory bias and outcome bias (Suri, 2020, p. 46).</p> <p>Suri states (2020, p. 47) 'systematic reviewers must carefully consider common forms of search biases; database, citation, availability, language, country, familiarity and multiple publication bias. The term 'grey literature' is sometimes used to refer to published and unpublished reports, such as government reports, that are not typically included in</p>
--	--	--

	<p>orientations or types of findings are more likely to be funded, published, cited and retrieved through common search channels (Petticrew, 2006). Serious ethical implications arise when reviews of biased research are drawn upon to make policy decisions with an assumption that review findings are representative</p>	<p>common research indexes and databases (Rothstein and Hopewell 2009). Several scholars recommend inclusion of grey literature to minimise potential impact of publication bias and search bias (Glass 2000) and to be inclusive of key policy documents and government reports (Godin et al. 2015).'</p> <p>'It is important for systematic reviewers to critically reflect upon contextual position of the authors of primary research studies included in the review, their methodological and pedagogical orientations, assumptions they are making, and how they might have influenced the findings of the original studies.' (Suri, 2020, p. 47)</p> <p>'Through informed subjectivity and reflexivity, systematic reviewers must ethically consider how their own contextual positioning is influencing the connected understandings they are constructing from the distilled evidence.'</p> <p>(Suri, 2020, p. 49). Critical reflection and</p>
--	---	--

	<p>of the larger population.'</p> <p>'Even after getting published, certain types of studies are more likely to be cited and retrieved through common search channels, such as key databases and professional networks (Petticrew and Roberts 2006)' (Suri, 2020, p. 46)</p>	<p>reflexivity shall be practiced throughout conducting the review.</p> <p>Awareness of equity, diversity and inclusion in the literature will be important. For example, critically reflecting on research from different locations /participants/environments and any dominant hegemonic epistemological lens used (Khan, 2023)</p> <p>Universities used in content analysis will be anonymised (Oliver, 2010)</p>
--	--	--

'Reviewers typically do not have direct access to participants of primary research studies included in their review. The information they analyse is inevitably refracted through the

	<p>subjective lens of authors of individual studies.' (Suri, 2020, p. 47)</p>	
	<p>The researcher's own positionality towards the literature and consequent impact on understanding, interpretation and analysis (Darwin Holmes, 2020, p. 5)</p>	

		<p>'Critically oriented systematic reviews should highlight how certain representation(s) silence or privilege some discourses over the others and how they intersect with the interests of various stakeholder groups (Baker 1999; Lather 1999; Livingston 1999).' (Suri, 2020, p. 50)</p>
--	--	---

	<p>The researcher works within higher education and may be at professional risk if findings raise politically or culturally controversial issues regarding institutions (BERA, 2024)</p> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>	
5	<p><b>University/institutional risks</b></p> <p>For example: adverse publicity, financial loss, data protection</p>	
	<p>Risk to the University:</p> <p>Conclusions made in the research may prove critical</p>	<p><i>How you will mitigate the risk to the University:</i></p> <p>The reviewer will ensure language used in conclusions and recommendations will be transparent and guide audience through any critical decisions made.</p> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>

	<p>of the norm and could put the reputation of the University at risk.</p> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>	
6	<p><b>Environmental risks</b></p> <p>For example: accidental spillage of pollutants, damage to local ecosystems</p>	
	<p>Risk to the environment:</p> <p>Overreliance of photocopying articles when researching.</p> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>	<p><i>How you will mitigate the risk to environment:</i></p> <p>Organising work digitally in a methodological way by using files on laptop</p> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>

<b>Disclosure and Barring Service</b>					
	If the research activity involves children or vulnerable adults, a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) certificate must be obtained before any contact with such participants.	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	
7	Does your research require you to hold a current DBS Certificate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8	If YES, please give the certificate number. If the certificate number is not available please write "Pending"; in this case any ethical approval will be subject to providing the appropriate certificate number.				

## **SECTION I: Feedback, Consent and Confidentiality**

1	<p><b>Feedback</b></p> <p>What de-briefing and feedback will be provided to participants, how will this be done and when?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A as a Literature Review</li> </ul> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>
2	<p><b>Informed consent</b></p> <p>Describe the arrangements to inform potential participants, before providing consent, of what is involved in participating. Describe the arrangements for participants to provide full consent before data collection begins. If gaining</p>

	consent in this way is inappropriate, explain how consent will be obtained and recorded in accordance with prevailing data protection legislation.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A as a Literature Review</li> </ul> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>
3	<p><b>Confidentiality / Anonymity</b></p> <p>Set out how anonymity of participants and confidentiality will be ensured in any outputs. If anonymity is not being offered, explain why this is the case.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A as a Literature Review</li> </ul> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>

## SECTION J: Data Protection and Storage

	Does the research activity involve personal data (as defined by the General Data Protection Regulation 2016 “GDPR” and the Data Protection Act 2018 “DPA”)?	YES	NO
1	<p><b>“Personal data”</b> means any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person ('data subject'). An identifiable natural person is one who can be identified, directly or indirectly, in particular by reference to an identifier such as a name, an identification number, location data, an online identifier or to one or more factors specific to the physical, physiological, genetic, mental, economic, cultural or social</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<i>identity of that natural person. Any video or audio recordings of participants is considered to be personal data.</i>		
	If YES, provide a description of the data and explain why this data needs to be collected:		
2	<i>(this box should expand as you type)</i>		
	Does it involve special category data (as defined by the GDPR)?	YES	NO
3	<p><b>“Special category data”</b> means sensitive personal data consisting of information as to the data subjects’ –</p> <p>(a) racial or ethnic origin,</p> <p>(b) political opinions,</p> <p>(c) religious beliefs or other beliefs of a similar nature,</p> <p>(d) membership of a trade union (within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992),</p> <p>(e) physical or mental health or condition,</p> <p>(f) sexual life,</p> <p>(g) genetics,</p> <p>(h) biometric data (as used for ID purposes),</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>
	If YES, provide a description of the special category data and explain why this data needs to be collected:		
4	<i>(this box should expand as you type)</i>		

<b>Will data from the research activity (collected data, drafts of the thesis, or materials for publication) be stored in any of the following ways?</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
5	Manual files (i.e. in paper form)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6	University computers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7	Private company computers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8	Home or other personal computers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9	Laptop computers/ CDs/ Portable disk-drives/ memory sticks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10	“Cloud” storage or websites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11	Other – specify:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12	For all stored data, explain the measures in place to ensure the security of the data collected, data confidentiality, including details of backup procedures, password protection, encryption, anonymisation and pseudonymisation:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A as a Literature Review</li> </ul> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>		

<b>Data Protection</b>			
Will the research activity involve any of the following activities:		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
13	Electronic transfer of data in any form?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14	Sharing of data with others at the University outside of the immediate research team?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15	Sharing of data with other organisations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

16	Export of data outside the UK or importing of data from outside the UK?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
17	Use of personal addresses, postcodes, faxes, emails or telephone numbers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18	Publication of data that might allow identification of individuals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
19	Use of data management system?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
20	Data archiving?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
21	If YES to any question, please provide full details, explaining how this will be conducted in accordance with the GDPR and Data Protection Act (2018) (and any international equivalents, where appropriate):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A as a Literature Review</li> </ul> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>		
22	List all who will have access to the data generated by the research activity:		
	<p>Laura Martin-Simpson</p> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>		
23	List who will have control of, and act as custodian(s) for, data generated by the research activity:		
	<p>Laura Martin-Simpson</p> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>		

24	<p>Give details of data storage arrangements, including security measures in place to protect the data, where data will be stored, how long for, and in what form.</p> <p>Will data be archived – if so how and if not why not.</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A as a Literature Review</li> </ul> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>		
25	<p>Please indicate if your data will be stored in the UWTSD Research Data Repository (see <a href="https://researchdata.uwtsd.ac.uk/">https://researchdata.uwtsd.ac.uk/</a> ). If so please explain. <i>(Most relevant to academic staff)</i></p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MA Dissertation Project</li> </ul> <p><i>(this box should expand as you type)</i></p>		
26	<p>Confirm that you have read the UWTSD guidance on data management (see <a href="https://www.uwtsd.ac.uk/library/research-data-management/">https://www.uwtsd.ac.uk/library/research-data-management/</a>)</p>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
27	<p>Confirm that you are aware that you need to keep all data until after your research has completed or the end of your funding</p>	<b>YES</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## SECTION K: Declaration

	<p>The information which I have provided is correct and complete to the best of my knowledge. I have attempted to identify any risks and issues related to the research activity and acknowledge my obligations and the rights of the participants.</p> <p>In submitting this application I hereby confirm that I undertake to ensure that the above named research activity will meet the University's Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Practice which is published on the website:</p> <p><a href="https://www.uwtsd.ac.uk/research/research-ethics/">https://www.uwtsd.ac.uk/research/research-ethics/</a></p>		
1	<b>Signature of applicant:</b>	Laura Martin-Simpson	<b>Date:</b> <b>09/02/25</b>

### For STUDENT Submissions:

2	Director of Studies/Supervisor:	Jessica Pitman	<b>Date:</b> <b>12/2/25</b>
3	Signature:	Jessica Pitman	

### For STAFF Submissions:

4	Academic Director/Assistant Dean:	
5	Signature:	

**Checklist:** Please complete the checklist below to ensure that you have completed the form according to the guidelines and attached any required documentation:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I have read the guidance notes supplied before completing the form.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I have completed <b>ALL RELEVANT</b> sections of the form in full.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I confirm that the research activity has received approval in principle
<input type="checkbox"/>	I have attached a copy of final/interim approval from external organisation <b>(where appropriate)</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	I have attached a full risk assessment (where appropriate) <i>ONLY TICK IF YOU HAVE ATTACHED A FULL RISK ASSESSMENT</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I understand that it is my responsibility to ensure that the above named research activity will meet the University's Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Practice.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I understand that before commencing data collection all documents aimed at respondents (including information sheets, consent forms, questionnaires, interview schedules etc.) must be confirmed by the DoS/Supervisor, module tutor or Academic Director.

#### **RESEARCH STUDENTS ONLY**

Once complete, submit this form via the **MyTSD Doctoral College Portal** at (<https://mytsd.uwtsd.ac.uk>).

#### **RESEARCH STAFF ONLY**

All communications relating to this application during its processing must be in writing and emailed to [pgresearch@uwtsd.ac.uk](mailto:pgresearch@uwtsd.ac.uk) , with the title 'Ethical Approval' followed by your name.

**STUDENTS ON UNDERGRADUATE OR TAUGHT MASTERS PROGRAMMES**

should submit this form (and receive the outcome) via systems explained to you by the supervisor/module leader.

**Reference List**

Barnett, R. (1994) 'Power, enlightenment and quality evaluation: The politics of quality assurance', *European journal of education*, 29(2), pp. 165–179.

BERA (2024) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research, fifth edition (2024) | BERA*. Available at: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-fifth-edition-2024> (Accessed: 18 May 2024).

Birks, M. *et al.* (2020) 'Managing the mutations: Academic misconduct Australia, New Zealand, and the UK', *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 16(1), pp. 1–15. doi: 10.1007/s40979-020-00055-5.

Bretag, T. and Mahmud, S. (2016) 'A Conceptual Framework for Implementing Exemplary Academic Integrity Policy in Australian Higher Education BT - Handbook of Academic Integrity', in Bretag, T. (ed.) *Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Singapore: Springer Singapore, pp. 463–480. doi: 10.1007/978-981-287-098-8\_24.

CASP UK (2025) *Systematic Reviews Checklist* - CASP. Available at: <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/systematic-review-checklist/> (Accessed: 9 February 2025).

CICCARIELLO-MAHER, G. (2021) *Decolonizing Dialectics, Decolonizing Dialectics*. Duke University Press. doi: 10.2307/j.ctv11smft7.

Darwin Holmes, A. G. (2020) 'Researcher Positionality - A Consideration of Its Influence and Place in Qualitative Research - A New Researcher Guide', *Shanlax*

*International Journal of Education*, 8(4), pp. 1–10. doi: 10.34293/education.v8i4.3232.

Eaton, S. E. (2022) *Why We Need to Pay Attention to Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in Student Conduct*, *BioMed Central*. Available at: <https://blogs.biomedcentral.com/on-society/2022/04/05/why-we-need-to-pay-attention-to-equity-diversity-and-inclusion-in-student-conduct/> (Accessed: 19 November 2023).

Eaton, S. E. (2024) 'Comprehensive Academic Integrity(CAI):An Ethical Framework for EducationalContexts', in *Second Handbook of Academic Integrity*, pp. 1–14.

Eaton, S. E. and Christensen Hughes, J. (2022) 'Academic Misconduct in Higher Education: Beyond Student Cheating', in *Academic Integrity in Canada*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing AG.

Fanon, F. (2021) *The Wretched of the Earth*. 60th Anniv. New York, USA: Grove Press.

Future Generations Commissioner for Wales (no date a) *A Globally Responsible Wales*. Available at: <https://www.futuregenerations.wales/a-globally-responsible-wales/>.

Future Generations Commissioner for Wales (no date b) *A More Equal Wales 1*:

Holliman, A. J. *et al.* (2023) 'Exploring the experiences of international Chinese students at a UK university: a qualitative inquiry', *Multicultural Learning and Teaching*, 0(0). doi: 10.1515/mlt-2022-0020.

Jisc (2023) 'International Students' Digital Experience'.

Khan, M. (2023) *Working Within Diversity: A Reflective Guide to Anti-Oppressive Practice in Counselling and Therapy*. London: Jessica Kinglsey Publishers.

Lomer, S. and Mittelmeier, J. (2023) 'Mapping the research on pedagogies with international students in the UK: a systematic literature review', *Teaching in higher education*, 28(6), pp. 1243–1263. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2021.1872532.

Mbutho, N. P. and Hutchings, C. (2021) 'The Complex Concept of Plagiarism: Undergraduate and Postgraduate Student Perspectives', *Perspectives in education*, 39(2), pp. 67–81. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v39.i2.6.

McGregor, A. *et al.* (2022) 'Supporting International Students in an Ontario College: A

Case for Multiple Interventions', *Canadian Journal of Action Research*, 22(2), p. 5.

Oliver, P. (2010) *The Student's Guide to Research Ethics*. Second. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Petticrew, M. (2006) *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: a practical guide*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Ploner, J. and Nada, C. (2020) 'International student migration and the postcolonial heritage of European higher education: perspectives from Portugal and the UK', *Higher education*, 80(2), pp. 373–389. doi: 10.1007/s10734-019-00485-2.

Roe, J. (2023) 'Discursive Construction of Contract Cheating and Degradation of Higher Education: Comments on The Daily Mail Online', *Forum, qualitative social research*, 24(2), pp. 1–20. doi: 10.17169/fqs-24.2.4000.

Said, E. W. (2003) *Orientalism*. [25th anniversary... New York: Vintage Books, a division of Random House.

Smolík, J. and Herbočková, L. (2021) 'ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS AT THE FACULTY OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES TOWARD PLAGIARISM', *HUMAN AFFAIRS*, 31, pp. 46–58. doi: 10.1515/humaff-2021-0005.

Snyder, H. (2019) 'Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines', *Journal of Business Research*, 104, pp. 333–339. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039.

Spivak, G. (1988) 'Can the subaltern speak?', *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture London*: pp. 24–28.

Stone, A. (2023) 'Student Perceptions of Academic Integrity: A Qualitative Study of Understanding, Consequences, and Impact', *Journal of academic ethics*, 21(3), pp. 357–375. doi: 10.1007/s10805-022-09461-5.

Suri, H. (2020) 'Ethical Considerations of Conducting Systematic Reviews in Educational Research -', in Zawacki-Richter, O. et al. (eds) *Systematic Reviews in Educational Research: Methodology, Perspectives and Application*. Wiesbaden:

Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, pp. 41–54. doi: 10.1007/978-3-658-27602-7\_3.

Sweeney, S. (2023) 'Who wrote this? Essay mills and assessment – Considerations regarding contract cheating and AI in higher education', *International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2). doi: 10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100818.

Tindall, I. K. et al. (2021) 'Can negative emotions increase students' plagiarism and cheating?', *International journal for educational integrity*, 17(1), pp. 1–16. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00093-7.

Tran, M. N., Hogg, L. and Marshall, S. (2022) 'Understanding postgraduate students' perceptions of plagiarism: a case study of Vietnamese and local students in New Zealand', *International journal for educational integrity*, 18(1), pp. 1–21. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00098-2.

Vaccino-Salvadore, S. and Buck, R. H. (2021) 'Moving from plagiarism police to integrity coaches: assisting novice students in understanding the relationship between research and ownership'. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00085-7.

Welsh Government (2018) A *Healthier Wales*: Available at: [papers3://publication/uuid/16791DE8-F836-4A19-ABAC-E1CFE366831F](https://papers3://publication/uuid/16791DE8-F836-4A19-ABAC-E1CFE366831F).

## b. Proposal Form



Institute of Education and Humanities/

Yr Athrofa Addysg a'r Dyniaethau

**MA Dissertation Approval Form/**

**Ffurflen Gymeradwyo Traethawd Hir MA**

Student Name/ <i>Enw Myfyriwr</i>	Laura Martin-Simpson
Degree Scheme/ <i>Cynllun Gradd</i>	MA Equity & Diversity in Society
Start date/ <i>Dyddiad cychwyn</i>	November 2023

I have completed Part 1 of my degree.

\*Please delete as appropriate.

*Yr wyf wedi/ ar fun cwblhau Rhan 1 o fy ngradd*

*\* Dileu fel sy'n briodol*

<b>Title of Dissertation:</b>
<i>Teitl eich Traethawd Hir</i>
An exploration into recent International MA Graduates' experiences of academic referencing and plagiarism
<b>Research Question</b>
<i>Cwestiwn Ymchwil</i>
What are the lived experiences of International MA Graduates regarding academic referencing and plagiarism whilst studying at a UK University?
<b>Aims and Objectives:</b>
<i>Nodau ac Amcanion</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To critically explore lived experience of International MA Graduates at a UK University</li><li>• To use thematic critical discourse analysis and constructivist critical theoretical frameworks to investigate lived experiences.</li><li>• To compare and correlate lived experiences of participants with research findings conducted in other Western Universities across</li></ul>
Abstract (approximately 500 words):
<i>Crynodeb (tua 500 gair):</i>
There is a disproportionate representation of International Students in academic misconduct cases both at University of South Wales (USW) and throughout Western Higher Education Institutions. This phenomenon has been researched/ acknowledged both academically and within practice for 30 years yet the issue is ever increasing.

## Literature Review

- Theme 1
  - Definitions
- Theme 2
  - Research findings from Universities outside of the UK
- Theme 3
  - Research findings from Universities within the UK

## Short Introductory Bibliography:

*Llyfryddiaeth rhagarweiniol byr*

BERA (2018) ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, fourth edition. London. Available at: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018> (Accessed: 6 January 2021).

Brons, L. L. (2015) 'Othering, an Analysis', *Transcience*, 6(1), pp. 69–90. Available at: [http://www2.hu-berlin.de/transcience/Vol6\\_No1\\_2015\\_69\\_90.pdf](http://www2.hu-berlin.de/transcience/Vol6_No1_2015_69_90.pdf).

Crenshaw, K. (2018) 'Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics', *Living With Contradictions: Controversies In Feminist Social Ethics*, 1989(1), pp. 39–52. doi: 10.4324/9780429499142-5.

Cutri, J. et al. (2021) 'Academic integrity at doctoral level: the influence of the imposter phenomenon and cultural differences on academic writing',

International journal for educational integrity, 17(1), pp. 1–16. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00074-w.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2011) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 4th edn. Edited by N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Equality Act 2010 (no date). United Kingdom. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/introduction> (Accessed: 13 June 2022).

Festas, I., Seixas, A. and Matos, A. (2022) 'Plagiarism as an academic literacy issue: the comprehension, writing and consulting strategies of Portuguese university students', *International journal for educational integrity*, 18(1), pp. 1–18. doi: 10.1007/s40979-022-00119-8.

Foucault, M. (2008) *Michel Foucault The Birth of Biopolitics*. Edited by M. Senellart et al. New York: Picador.

Go, J. (2013a) 'Fanon's postcolonial cosmopolitanism', *European journal of social theory*, 16(2), pp. 208–225. doi: 10.1177/1368431012462448.

Go, J. (2013b) 'For a postcolonial sociology', *Theory and society*, 42(1), pp. 25–55. doi: 10.1007/s11186-012-9184-6.

Gregory, J. L. (2021) 'Plagiarism as a Social Contract, a New Way to Approach Plagiarism', *Journal of academic ethics*, 19(3), pp. 407–424. doi: 10.1007/s10805-021-09409-1.

Helen Parkin and Emma Heron (2023) 'Listening works: using the Listening Rooms methodology to explore diversity', *Journal of learning development in higher education*, (26). doi: 10.47408/jldhe.vi26.914.

Hossain, Z. (2022) 'University freshmen recollect their academic integrity literacy experience during their K-12 years: results of an empirical study', *International journal for educational integrity*, 18(1), pp. 1–18. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00096-4.

Kim, H. J. and Uysal, H. (2021) 'Shifting the discourse of plagiarism and ethics: a cultural opportunity in higher education', *International journal of ethics education*, 6(1), pp. 163–176. doi: 10.1007/s40889-020-00113-z.

Kochuvilayil, T. et al. (2021) 'COVID-19: Knowledge, anxiety, academic concerns and preventative behaviours among Australian and Indian undergraduate nursing students: A cross-sectional study', *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 30(5–6), pp. 882–891. doi: 10.1111/jocn.15634.

Lemert, C. and Branaman, A. (1997) *The Goffman Reader*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing Inc.

Liang, A., Maddison, T. and England, S. (no date) 'Proactive not Punitive: Strategies to Prevent Plagiarism and Promote International Student Success'.

Mbutho, N. P. and Hutchings, C. (2021) 'The Complex Concept of Plagiarism: Undergraduate and Postgraduate Student Perspectives', *Perspectives in education*, 39(2), pp. 67–81. doi: 10.18820/2519593X/pie.v39.i2.6.

McGregor, A. et al. (2022) 'Supporting International Students in an Ontario College: A Case for Multiple Interventions', *Canadian Journal of Action Research*, 22(2), p. 5.

McKenna, S. (2022) 'Plagiarism and the commodification of knowledge', *Higher education*, 84(6), pp. 1283–1298. doi: 10.1007/s10734-022-00926-5.

Mercer, J. (2007) 'The challenges of insider research in educational institutions', *Oxford review of education*, 33(1), pp. 1–17. doi: 10.1080/03054980601094651.

Mukasa, J., Stokes, L. and Mukona, D. M. (2023) 'Academic dishonesty by students of bioethics at a tertiary institution in Australia: an exploratory study', *International journal for educational integrity*, 19(1), pp. 1–15. doi: 10.1007/s40979-023-00124-5.

Parnther, C. (2022) 'International Students and Academic Misconduct: Considering Culture, Community, and Context', *Journal of college and character*, 23(1), pp. 60–75. doi: 10.1080/2194587X.2021.2017978.

Sanni-Anibire, H. et al. (2021) 'International students' knowledge and emotions related to academic integrity at Canadian postsecondary institutions'. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00088-4.

Shoyukhi, M. et al. (2023) 'Developing a comprehensive plagiarism assessment rubric', *Education and information technologies*, 28(5), pp. 5893–5919. doi: 10.1007/s10639-022-11365-1.

Smolík, J. and Herbočková, L. (2021) 'ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS AT THE FACULTY OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES TOWARD PLAGIARISM', *HUMAN AFFAIRS*, 31, pp. 46–58. doi: 10.1515/humaff-2021-0005.

Tan, E. and Carnegie, S. (2022) "It's not plagiarism, it's a bad use of power phrasing": Assessment of home and international student (mis)understandings of citation practice', *Innovations in education and teaching international*, 59(3), pp. 285–295. doi: 10.1080/14703297.2020.1844779.

Tindall, I. K. et al. (2021) 'Can negative emotions increase students' plagiarism and cheating?', International journal for educational integrity, 17(1), pp. 1–16. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00093-7.

Tran, M. N., Hogg, L. and Marshall, S. (2022) 'Understanding postgraduate students' perceptions of plagiarism: a case study of Vietnamese and local students in New Zealand', International journal for educational integrity, 18(1), pp. 1–21. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00098-2.

United Nations (no date) THE 17 GOALS | Sustainable Development. Available at: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals> (Accessed: 7 May 2023).

Vaccino-Salvadore, S. and Buck, R. H. (2021) 'Moving from plagiarism police to integrity coaches: assisting novice students in understanding the relationship between research and ownership'. doi: 10.1007/s40979-021-00085-7.

Proposed Supervisor:

*Goruchwylwr awgrymedig*

Associate Professor C Lohmann-Hancock

- Ethics Form will be required
- Please indicate whether sufficient resources are available for the project
  - YES/NO
- *Nodwch a oes digon o adnoddau ar gael ar gyfer y prosiect*
  - OES / NAC OES

The above topic, proposal, and supervisor have been agreed:

*Cytunwyd ar y pwnc, y cynnig a'r goruchwylwr uchod:*

Signed : .....Laura Martin-Simpson..... Student/ Laura Martin-  
Simpson  
Llofnod Myfyriwr

Date:...07/10/23

Date:.....12/10/2023

## Dyddiad

**Please return this form to your Programme Director.**

**Dychwelwch y ffurflen hon at eich Cyfarwyddwr Rhaglen.**

**c. Sample of analysis spreadsheet**

Theme	1. Deficit Discourse	p.	2. Epistemic Dominance	p.	3. Institutional Power	p.	4. Identity	p.	5. Voice and Agency	p.
Theoretical Anchor	PCT: Othering / CRT Deficit Thinking Model		PCT: Epistemic Violence / CRT: Whiteness as property		PCT: Coloniality of power / CRT: Construction of deviance and criminality		Anti-Essentialism. PCT: Homogeneity / CRT: Intersectionality		PCT: Subaltern silencing / CRT: Counter-storytelling	
Guiding question	To what extent does [the] research focus on deficits, challenges, or problems of international students, and who or what does it problematize?		How has [the] framing of the research 'problem' been shaped by colonial [epistemic] assumptions?		To what extent does the research examine institutional structures and mechanisms of power and domination and oppression and how they are embedded and experienced by international		How does the research incorporate understandings of racialisation and intersectionality?		To what extent does the research centre international students as agents, empowered, and central to knowledge creation?	
Cross-Cultural Challenging student face	972	extensive use of Hofstede - essentialist culture fixing - homogeni	972	awareness that HEIs and staff and practices are ethnically biased	982	academic language barrier	974	recognition of supremacy of WWW bad ethnocentric ass	974	
Cross-Cultural Challenging student face	975	only use western cultural theorist - whiteness as normal	973	sensitivity to anxiety, home sick	975	recognition some students 'polycentrism' but use of homogeni	982			
Cross-Cultural Challenges Faced by International Students: A Case Study of Indian Students in the UK	973	foreigners mental state of infant - unchallenged need to acco	973	HEI responsibility to map out pedagogic differences	982	we feel meaning	981	aware student don't have to acculturate to have good	981	
Cross-Cultural Challenging student face	974	presents academics as battalions for truth - nightingale	974	acknowledges intersectional and holistic barriers impact	982	aware pressure to acculturatare	981			
Cross-Cultural Challenging student face	977	awareness white less racism but doesn't expand	975							
Cross-Cultural Challenging student face	977	virtue vs truth -	983							
Cross-Cultural Challenging student face	978	must assimilate	983							
Cross-Cultural Challenging student face	980	essentialist theorist	985							
Cross-Cultural Challenging student face	983									
Cross-Cultural Challenging student face	983									
Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional AI policies, procedures, tea	3	awareness AI is complex and take time to learn	3	HEI's failing international students - awarding gaps - AcI - 'in	3	need for intersectional awareness and holistic support	3	passive victims	9	
Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional AI policies, procedures, tea	3	interest convergence - IS focus but what about the poor whi	4	discuss crimes and punitive discourse in field	3	clumped in with first generation and widening participation	3	resistance to pedagogoy and lack of time - implied assum	9	
Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional AI policies, procedures, tea	3	do not define AC/AM or any academic terms	3	lack of inclusion / not systemic racism of international st	3	students from 'certain groups' - homog	15	powerless		
Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional AI policies, procedures, tea	11	policy/sites - assumed western epistemology	11	students experience judgment and punitive measures	7			not bloning to academic community	13	
Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional AI policies, procedures, tea	13	all process and policy and concepts assumed knowledge of	13	does talk about racism in AM	9			connected to identity - deficit - don't know anything	14	
Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional AI policies, procedures, tea	13	however, focuses on good practice examples rather than the l	10					large quotes from students - but not aware of power dy	7	
Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional AI policies, procedures, tea	13	critique of AI documents - difficult	10					voic eot student about IS and AI but then had to bac	8	
Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional AI policies, procedures, tea	13	policy documents over complex with terminology - not	11, 13					student belong but discusses 'staff inractice' need to foc	10	
Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional AI policies, procedures, tea	13	'problems with inclusion' - colourblind = racist / exclusive						chnieg to system , proceses and new educational route	15	
Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional AI policies, procedures, tea	13	found to be punitive and need to change	13							
Examining and improving inclusive practice in institutional AI policies, procedures, tea	13	OUTSIDERS - broein rules of system and community	13							
Postgrad student p IS challenge to adapt, differing abilities	2	defines integrity and AM - aligns with morality values and ch	1	punitive discourse 'committing'	3	discusses potential impacts but through deficit model	3	lack of studeen challenge and critique systems and policies	5	
Postgrad student p IS challenge to adapt, differing abilities	2	IS must adapt	2	AM = cheating	2	highlights diversity and n=educatioal background	6	use of quotes but don't know who from and poor demo	5	
Postgrad student p IS challenge to adapt, differing abilities	2	responsibility focus on IS students to engage with support ra	6	increases more institutional responsibility	5	interimen and Inconsistent use of 'international student'	6			
Postgrad student p IS challenge to adapt, differing abilities	2			like most studies concludes it's the institutions responsibility but ....						
Postgrad student p IS challenge to adapt, differing abilities	2									
Postgrad student p IS challenge to adapt, differing abilities	2									
Postgrad student p IS challenge to adapt, differing abilities	2									
Evaluating a pedagogical approach to promoting academic integrity in higher education: An	1	all western sources - findings -	2	institutional responsibility	3	awareness of PG intersections	3	discusso of passivity vs agency but 'uploders' suggest	2	
Evaluating a pedagogical approach to promoting academic integrity in higher education: An	9	definition if AI and AM in moral values - UKcentric - though in	2					talk about international student in lit review but then d	4	
Evaluating a pedagogical approach to promoting academic integrity in higher education: An	9	AI western presented as superior and not understood rather	2					not a lot of quotes used vs level of topic discussions	6	
Evaluating a pedagogical approach to promoting academic integrity in higher education: An	10	evaluates complexity ad lack of consistency in definitions a	2					use of different remiology 'non-domestic, - internatio	6	
Evaluating a pedagogical approach to promoting academic integrity in higher education: An	10	over simplification of international students' - racism	2					no discussion about specific impacts for IS students give	7	
Evaluating a pedagogical approach to promoting academic integrity in higher education: An	10	use of image of learning tool all white figures	5					homogenisation when suits to 'students' interest conv	10	
Evaluating a pedagogical approach to promoting academic integrity in higher education: An	10	I am less likely to know about AI policies - assumption AI does	9					recommendations will be 'taken into consideration'	9	
Evaluating a pedagogical approach to promoting academic integrity in higher education: An	10							request of education rather than punishment	9	
Language Ideology Awareness of racism and racial stereotyping if IS student and pla	2	HE and globalisation - extention of white supremacy and ep	2	linguistic racism	2	language, race, Chinese	2	focuses on resistance and cost	7	
Language Ideology Intellectual citizenship - power to become	3	IS and exports'	2	argues racism not discussed in IS research	2	feelings directly relate to racism can be correlated to t	2	students don't always define themselve	9	
Language Ideologies of Racial Microaggression and Institutional Whiteness: Experiences of International HE sustained global hegemony of western academ	3	written from CRT perspective						recognition that students are/can be 'agents of change'	9	
Language Ideologies of Racial Microaggression and Institutional Whiteness: Experiences of Chinese International Students in UK Higher Education	3	colourblind HE	4	linguistic racism	7	large use of participant quotes - counter story telling	5			
Language Ideologies of Racial Microaggression and Institutional Whiteness: Experiences of Chinese International Students in UK Higher Education	4	punitive - IS highly visible identity	7, 9	can cause poor academic performance	9	researcher conjecture? Emotionality of language?	6			
Language Ideologies of Racial Microaggression and Institutional Whiteness: Experiences of Chinese International Students in UK Higher Education	4	denial of racism	8					yes - embed within current practice and initiativs	9	
Language Ideologies of Racial Microaggression and Institutional Whiteness: Experiences of Chinese International Students in UK Higher Education	4									
Fear of failure: a st AM, plague, degeneration, battle, undermining - since inception	1	definition of contract cheating but assumed knowledge of AI	2	cheaters - used an noun - removes identity	2	lack of self-confidence	3	did sumplementary interview but no quotes or direct discu	9, 10	
Fear of failure: a st IS - more inclined to cheat - 'lack study skills' - only for visa/reside	3	commercialisation over student experience - imperialism	4	international contract cheaters - DEVIANC	3	concretes literature discourse on interantional but th	7			
Fear of failure: a st aware of added challenges and 'stereotyping' but by fitting first part	3	equal footing regardless of internation status -	9	students must commit to AI policies	3	all lumped into one IS	8			
Fear of failure: a st tends with larguemeit that dispells deviant myth but who section is	4	no awareness of diverse epistemologies - students must confor	9	relates awareness of AI policies to AI practice rather th	6	aware of intersectional but all lumped				
Fear of failure: a st IS = only have 1 culture that is 'other to western academic'	8	reinforcement of AI policies and principles	10							
Fear of failure: a st 'aid based' - rather than support and HE responsibility - power dy	9									
Fear of failure: a st 'naivety' and challenge	10									
International Postgraduate Students' Perceptions of Learning Difficulties and Their Impact o	21	awareness of different ep traditions for IS definition of 'academ	21	HE responsibility but don't think of power imbalanc	31	Asian as on group	22, 23	negotiation - all on student to adapt and not HE	31	
International Postg binary east vs west	22	must conform but no help to adapt	29			language test not academic language	22	substantial use of quotes	23	
International Postg hofstede	21	struggle but appreciate - through adversity	31							
International Postg argues IDEOLOGICAL framework CRT	21									
International Postg obstacle of lack of knowledge, struggle	22, 29									
International Postg use of 'different and diverge	27									
International Postg passivity misunderstood and not understanding	27									
International Postg insufficient home culture education skills	28									
Improving the Lear awareness of deficit model and resp to adapt	625	CULTURE SHOCK	626	awareness of stayed institutional practices and commun	630			reafirms agency	626	
Improving the Lear deficit vs asset	626	staff responsibility to emphasise emails	630	explicitly talks about racism - other		awareness of homogen in research	626	focuses on student experience	626	
Improving the Learning Experience of Chinese Masters students in UK higher education	631	HE not diverse in academic learning practices and resource	631	less favourable treatmet for academic support -	633			discussion arund what student want not an interpretatio	629	
Improving the Learning Experience of Chinese Masters students in UK higher education	633	DOM vs UK divide of support and assumption of knowledge	633	restrictive policies that aren't undersodd or explained	633			goes back and forth with quotes so all recommendatio	630	
Improving the Learning Experience of Chinese Masters students in UK higher education	634	export money vs no return investment	634	university ranking - hypothesis not found in other univ	634					
Explorin the expert deficit: challenges, adjustments, ethnic clustering	2	awareness of differing epistemic norms	3					isolation, loniness - discrimination racism but doesn't	8	
Explorin the expert failure to adapt means not being part of academic of wider comm	3	expectance of www academic norms	10					a lot of student quotes	8	
Explorin the expert learning shock / native frameworks'	4, 13	expectation that must adapt and change values and beliefs	14, 15							
Explorin the expert focuses on binary culture difference	4									
Studying in this Eng academic stress rather than shock	2406	statiutes research within UK education colonial past and her	2406	call out institutional racism in comparison to studies tha	2408	intersec both within home country and UK	2407	give agency - what student bring rather than lack	2408	
Studying in this Eng stereotypes of subordinate and deficit and deviant	2408	white education as property	2407	institutional racism - deviant assumed	2414	highly intersectional	2409	epistemic negotiation	2411	
Studying in this Eng assumed academic low standard	2413	african education - inferiro	2411			policiatal aspect home and UK	2411	assumed / accepted will be hard and will face racism	2414	
Studying in this England is wahala (trouble): analysing the experiences of West African students	2413	all assumed knwoldege	2413							
Studying in this England is wahala (trouble): analysing the experiences of West African students	2414	assumed don't know about plagiarism but don't help	2414							