

© *Journal of International Students*
Volume 9, Issue 4 (2019), pp. 1191-1195
ISSN: 2162-3104 (Print), 2166-3750 (Online)
Doi: 10.32674/jis.v0i0.618
ojed.org/jis

Tannock, S. (2018). *Educational Equality and International Students*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Minghui Hou
Old Dominion University, USA

As an international student, until recently I had never thought about educational equality for international students because it seemed impossible for an international student to have the same opportunities or resources as domestic students. *Educational Equality and International Students*, recently published by Tannock (2018), explores and highlights how to conceptualize and promote principles of educational equality for both international and domestic students in the United Kingdom. Tannock's book includes empirical research consisting of 60 interviews with higher education staff and students, as well as the use of higher education institutional documents and secondary statistics collected from universities and national higher education organizations around the UK. Tannock addresses the contradictions between the missions of higher education institutions (universalistic principles of human rights in equal education) and their practices regarding international students as "cash cows" that keep the university afloat (p. 110).

Speaking from personal experiences, educational equality should ensure all individuals have the same opportunities to access educational institutions and educational achievement and success, and the principle of equality should be for the public good in society as a whole and be central to educational practice, policy, and purpose.

Marketization of Higher Education

Chapters 3 and 6 of this publication address the competing forces of marketization, immigration restriction, and international students as "cash cows," as well as their function in extending "soft power." For example, in 2008, international students needed to be sponsored by an education institution having a state-granted Tier 4 sponsor license in order to have a Tier 4 visa to come to the UK. The Tier 4 regime has led to a fundamental change among the state, universities, and

international students in the UK. The Home Office with extensive power over policy and practice has become “a major regulator of higher education in the UK” (Tannock, 2008, p. 48).

Notable among the points made in this section is the analysis of immigration policy in the UK. The National Union of Students has taken some measures across the country, seeking “to provide protection for international students at educational institutions that lose their Tier 4 license...to reduce the required bank balance levels” in order to build a welcoming country to attract international students (Tannock, 2008, p. 56). It is essential for universities and international student organizations to take efforts to protect international students from the government-led immigration crackdown.

This also provides an instructive example for the United States. During the current presidential administration, an unwelcoming environment has been built for international students, including the tightening of visa regulations, increasing visa fees, and three versions of the Trump travel ban (Executive Order 13769). President Trump initiated an Executive Order that prohibited the entry of citizens from certain Muslim countries in January of 2017 as the original travel ban. The second travel ban was reinstated by the Supreme Court, in which international students, employees, and scholarly visitors to universities were exempt from the ban in June of 2017 (Stein, 2018). The third ban restricted the entry of tourists or business or student visas from the Muslim-majority countries of Iran (except student and exchange visitor visas), Libya (on tourist or business visas), Somalia (on immigrant visas for nationals), Syria (on immigrant visas for nationals), and Yemen (on tourist or business visas). The ban also includes North Korea (on all travel for nationals) and Venezuela (on some government officials). This unwelcoming environment, along with policies of the Trump administration, have affected “racialized students, faculty, staff, and campus visitors” (Stein, 2018, p. 894).

The question of whether international students ought to be charged higher university tuition fees than their native counterparts to ensure educational equality is also discussed in this section. According to the University of Sunderland (as cited in Tannock, 2018), international students are charged higher tuition fees than home students because the UK government provides subsidies for home students through domestic taxes. However, Tannock claims that UK law does not require international students to pay higher tuition fees than home students, but only requires “international students not receive a public subsidy for their education” (p. 132). Higher education has been putting too much emphasis on “opening up markets for foreign study, increasing flows, and maximizing the market potential of foreign study” (Altbach, 2015, p. 2) without considering how international education serves for the public good in both home countries and international countries.

Fragmentation and Issues in Internationalization

Chapters 4, 5, 7, and 8 demonstrate the fragmentation and issues of educational equality in internationalized universities. Chapter 4 categorizes fragmentation of equality into institutional fragmentation, spatial fragmentation, and temporal fragmentation. *Institutional fragmentation* refers to the tendency for “equality” and

“international” staff to work in different departments. University equality offices tend to focus on equality issues for university staff. The widening access offices handle the main equality issues in higher education academic policy and practice literature for students. International offices focus on the issues that concern international students. *Spatial fragmentation* refers to home and international students being charged differently based on “a combination of their nationality and residency” (Tannock, 2018, p. 74). In the context of *temporal fragmentation*, international students are treated differently than home students in the context of the academic environment even though they are considered to have equal rights as home students. For instance, international students are subject to mandatory attendance monitoring. In sum, international students are singled out and excluded from educational equality due to institutional, spatial, and temporal fragmentation.

Chapter 5 provides the rationale for the fragmentation and how absent global equality structures impact international students. Chapter 7 explores the extreme inequalities in international education, particularly the inequality of curriculum. Chapter 8 examines international students’ exclusion from UK students in academic attainment. University College London is only concerned with the gap between the academic attainment of white and black or minority ethnic British students. One rationale is that researchers have demonstrated variation in academic achievement between home students and non-EU international students. Comrie found that home and EU students were likely to achieve a higher level than non-international students overall, while non-EU international students tended to achieve a higher level than home students in the field of accounting and finance.

In light of market-centric competition, nation-state equality legislation has provided equality and justice protection for international students in the UK to attract more international students. For instance, an All-Party Parliamentary Group for International Students has formed to emphasize the importance of international students to employment and educational market. Some alternative agendas have been made to promote equality and justice. Chevening Scholarships and Fellowships are funded by the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office in order to provide financial and institutional support for individuals from other countries and equality legislation protecting international students from discrimination and unequal treatment (“About Chevening,” 2015). These policies could act as forces to ensure educational equality.

In addition, Tannock touches on the terminology of Stier (2004)—instrumentalism, idealism, and educationalism—to help international students adapt, adjust, accommodate, and succeed in the UK higher education system. *Idealism* refers to how higher education contributes to “the creation of a more democratic, fair and equal world” (Steir, 2004, p. 88). *Instrumentalism* refers to higher education as a means “to maximize profit, ensure economic growth and sustainable development, or to transit desirable of ideologies of governments, transnational corporations, interest groups or supranational regimes” (p. 90). The ideology of educationalism implies that internationalization is a response to competence demands and to be used to “an unfamiliar academic setting” (p. 90) and to enrich the academic experiences of students and staff alike. In particular, Tannock emphasizes how the various internationalized curricula should be used in UK universities in the name of educational equality and justice, and how they ought to provide British students with

international education. In the process of the internationalization of the curriculum, international students have become a part of the curriculum (as cited in Tannock, 2018). Furthermore, through this type of activity, UK universities promote the concept of “global citizenship” for both international and home students.

Finally, this section examines inequalities and exclusions in UK universities due to economic, political, social, and cultural obstacles, underscoring how international students have been excluded from research and policy discussions. To do so, Tannock draws on examples from national legislation and institutional internationalization to suggest transformations of higher education pedagogy, curriculum, and pedagogy practice for the benefits of both international and home students in the UK.

Ongoing Issues and Conclusions

Tannock concludes his analysis by situating this publication as a “starting point for a broader and more far-ranging conversation, not an end point and not with any claim of comprehensiveness or conclusively” (p. 217). Indeed, he explores two other broad issues: How typical are internationalized universities in the UK when compared with other countries? How can the situation of educational equality in the UK contribute to global equality and justice in education around the world? Tannock not only poses the importance of educational equality but also provides analysis, answers, and examples.

Tannock makes a pivotal contribution to international educational equality with this contribution to the literature. However, Tannock does not address the difference between educational equality and equity. Corson noted that “equity” is related to fairness or justice in education and it takes various circumstances into consideration, while “equality” usually refers to the same treatment by “asserting the fundamental or natural equality of all persons” (as cited in Espinoza, 2007, p. 345). Equality means that international students and domestic students should have the equal access to universities, which indicates the same requirements for application and the same tuition. Equity means that international students need to have an individualized curriculum to help them better adapt to a foreign environment to be successful. Future research about international educational equality and equity will be needed.

REFERENCES

- About Chevening*. (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.chevening.org/about-chevening>.
- Altbach, P. (2015). Foreign study: Patterns and challenges. *International Higher Education*, (30). <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2003.30.7355>
- Espinoza, O. (2007). Solving the equity–equality conceptual dilemma: A new model for analysis of the educational process. *Educational Research*, 49(4), 343–363.
- Stein, S. (2018). Racialized frames of value in US university responses to the travel ban. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 17(4).
- Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 2(1), 1–28.

Tannock, S. (2018). *Educational equality and international students*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

MINGHUI HUO is a graduate assistant in the Batten College of Engineering and Technology at Old Dominion University. Her major research interests lie in the areas of internationalization, international education equity, immigration policy, and international student mobility. Email: mhou009@odu.edu
