**Title: ‘***We loved it because we felt that we existed there in the classroom!’* International students as epistemic equals vs. double country oppression.

**Abstract:**

The paper compares student narratives of engagement in internationalisation in the UK and Germany. The comparison signals a new area of critical sociology of internationalisation which shows signs that internationalisation in non-Anglophone countries may evolve under conditions the paper calls ‘double-country oppression’. ‘Double-country oppression’ denotes a situation whereby international students are put at risk of exclusion not only on the basis of lacking characteristics that ‘bind’ them to the country of education (in this case Germany) but also, and perhaps primarily, because they lack characteristics that ‘bind’ them to Anglophone countries, despite their education taking place in a non-Anglophone country. As such, ‘double-country oppression’ has important pragmatic and conceptual implications as it calls into question analytical paradigms which center around the nation state. The emergence of ‘double-country oppression’ also challenges the view that there are new possibilities for epistemic democracy as more non-Anglophone countries enter the internationalisation competition.
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**Introduction:**

The article focuses on the articulation and practice of internationalisation at two case study universities, one in the UK and one in Germany. Through reviewing these cases, the article begins to shape a new understanding of the ways in which internationalisation may be developing in non-Anglophone countries and shows how the nature and scope of these developments may limit realisation of international students as epistemic equals.

Internationalisation and epistemic democracy are defined in detail in section ‘Internationalisation, Nation State and Epistemic Democracy’ of this paper, but for brevity here, internationalisation is taken to mean a ‘process of change’ (Knight, 2004) which denotes the growth of universities that enter into new social and educational interdependencies with international people and that, as a result, accept these people as equally qualified knowers ( Salili & Hoosain, 2010). Epistemic democracy means equivalence of different geopolitical sources of knowledge, as well as acknowledging them and actively promoting (through classroom practice) as equally valid (Mignolo, 2009; Aman, 2018). Epistemic democracy also means treating all ‘knowers’ in the classroom as equal (Dahl, 2000).

The comparison between the UK and Germany is purposeful, as it reviews in-country differences that draw attention to nation-state characteristics which may initially suggest that Germany is more likely than the UK to engage in approaches to internationalisation which emphasise epistemic democracy. This comparison, however, also begins to highlight that the symbolic value of in-country differences may on the other hand be shattered by commercial self-interests of institutions and its students, which shape some of the misconceptions about internationalisation that lead to perceptions that only Anglophone knowledge is valid. This latter point therefore, in combination with the findings that emerge in this paper, provides some grounding for the theoretical argument this article begins to develop - namely, that non-Anglophone countries, despite their ‘international students-friendly’ public discourses, may put international students at risk of ‘double country oppression’, as they exclude international students not only on the basis of some in-country characteristics but also, and primarily because of, the influence of homogeneity that underpins the process of signification of Anglophone students, their language and the knowledge they produce. Thus, given the influence of this type of homogeneity on the German case revealed in the analysis section below, the paper critiques how its scope and nature may influence the potential for epistemic democracy in non-Anglophone countries. Such critique can be vital, especially at a time when more non-Anglophone countries in Europe enter the internationalisation competition (de Wit et al., 2015).

Moreover, emerging research from continental Europe has suggested that differences in constructions of higher education students are related to various welfare regimes, with significant differences evident between social democratic countries, post-Communist states and Anglophone nations that have embraced marketisation of higher education more fully (e.g. Brooks, 2018). Yet, in relation to international students specifically, our knowledge of their constructions in Europe is still partial (e.g. Wiers-Jenssen, 2018) and little is known about the actual responses to them on the ground, in university classrooms. There is still a lot to be learnt about the political, social and classroom responses to international students, especially in countries such as Germany which, traditionally, have not regarded higher education as a ‘business’ but are now subject to socio-political tensions resulting from international students arrivals being increasingly associated with, and encouraged by, marketisation of higher education (Gardner, 2017). This paper addresses specifically the question of reciprocation with international students on the ground, in university classrooms. Through that, it calls into question analytical paradigms that focus on the role of the nation state in shaping responses to internationalisation and specifically the view that internationalisation as a worldwide phenomenon is mainly realised in distinctive forms that are local (e.g. Johnstone & Proctor,2018; Tamtik & Kirss, 2016; Zmas, 2015). Subsequently, the paper also interrogates the expectation which follows from this view - namely, that more inclusive attitudes towards and policy constructions of international students as people who bring new intellectual capital to universities in countries such as Germany (Graf, 2009; Hillman, 2015) are likely to create conditions for their inclusion in the classroom as epistemic equals.

The data in the paper suggest that there is a hierarchy in terms of who *actually* gets to produce knowledge, which in turn points to specific framing of the ‘desirable international student’ (shaped by the case study universities and the host country students). This framing is discriminatory in nature, based on criteria related to students’ cultural and citizenship capitals. What is also important is that the notion of the ‘desirable international student’ that emerges in this paper is *not* basedon the extent of intellectual and cultural alignment with the *host* country (as some of the ‘nation-state-based’ perspectives cited in subsequent sections of this paper would have us believe) but rather on the trends in internationalisation that emphasise the homogeneity in knowledge production that position Anglophone perspectives as normative. These trends are outlined in the analysis, suggesting important implications for critical sociology of internationalisation - in the sense of ‘double-country oppression’ being a phenomenon that may be increasingly seen, as we analyse internationalisation in non-Anglophone countries in future research.

The paper presents the findings from the empirical interviews and the analysis first. This is done to highlight the inductive approach to data analysis and to ground some of the arguments about ‘double-country oppression’ in these data. The data in the paper were collected from a sample of 6 students in a German university and from 10 students in a UK university. Both universities were selected conveniently and students were drawn from the social sciences. It needs to be highlighted that the intention of the research was *not* to generalise, but rather to interview a broad range of students, to gain insights that might have wider implications. Hence, in each university students were selected randomly which resulted in samples representing both genders and a broad variety of nationalities, as well as postgraduate and undergraduate students . Student nationalities included: Saudi Arabia, Oman, Indonesia, Turkey, China, Afghanistan, Italy, Spain (the EU students in Germany were included in the sample as they are classed as international students). The postgraduate-undergraduate ratio was approximately 1:3, and gender balance was about 70% female and 30% male. Despite the sample being small and not representative, the intention behind presenting the findings first is to enable readers to see how the findings from this small sample may have wider implications, as the readers read through the specific to then move to thinking about more general applications. So, the findings are not used here as ‘proof’ but rather as an ‘impulse’ to draw attention to the complexities of and the myriad of factors that may be affecting epistemic democracy in non-Anglophone countries and to signal that ‘double-country oppression’ may be a phenomenon that requires analyses beyond perspectives cantering the nation state. Consequently, the sections that follow the presentation of the findings and the analysis canvass academic areas and theoretical ideas for which ‘double-country oppression’ may be relevant.

**The Research, Findings and Analysis**

The research set out to answer the following questions: a) *How is internationalisation, in the sense of commitment to international students as epistemic equals, articulated and practiced at case study universities in the UK and Germany?* and b) *In what ways (if any) does this commitment differ between the UK and Germany?* The method used to answer these questions was unstructured narrative interviews which were centred around students’ general experiences of studying in their countries of education. Students were encouraged to tell stories that were of importance to them as ‘international students’ and to explain why. There were no specific interview questions, but rather the students were encouraged to start with a story they wanted to tell, which then prompted further questions. The students were however briefed that the research was framed around internationalisation and how it is articulated and practised at their universities. Each student was interviewed in a one-to-one interview, in English, with each interview lasting about 1 hour. Interviews were recorded on a portable audio-recorder.

The analysis was inductive and focused on how each student as an individual (rather than in comparison to one another) experienced study in their country of education. The focus was on ‘critical events’ (Webster & Mertrova, 2007), i.e. significant situations that made each student think about their experiences of internationalisation and to what extend their ‘foreign’ status played a role in these experiences. The analysis focused on the meaning of the stories as a window onto understanding how the ‘versions’ of internationalisation practised at students’ universities were affecting their realisation as epistemic equals. Individual codes that emerged in the analysis are presented in Appendix 1. Through open, axial and selective coding (details in the appendix), the analysis identified two key themes of *‘Double-country oppression’* and *‘Stepping over some ethical questions’.* These are discussed below. The table in Appendix 1 also outlines the connection of the codes to the type of literature which reflects the academic field within which the findings from the research can be ‘housed’ and for which they have some theoretical implications. This literature is discussed in detail in the section that follows the presentation of the findings. Thus, the quotes that are selected below are those that are most illustrative of the ways in which internationalisation was thought by the students to shape approaches to diversity in HE and how the students thought understandings of internationalisation at their universities created conditions for their inclusion and exclusion as epistemic equals. Other quotes that emerged in the research but are not cited here were about students’ coping strategies when living away from home, friendships and transformations of identity. Whilst important, these codes have not been included here, given the focus of the paper on *institutional* commitment to articulation and practice of internationalisation that creates opportunities for epistemic democracy. They are however listed in Appendix 1. In the quotes below which contain both interviewer questions and students responses, ‘S’ refers to students and ‘I’ refers to the interviewer.

***‘Double-country oppression’***

While international students were keen to embrace the plurality associated with opportunities of studying alongside students from diverse backgrounds, revealed through statements such as *‘I really enjoy learning about different cultures’ (Student 4, England)*, they did not find the same level of cultural reciprocity in relation to their own characteristics. Some students could not understand why this was the case, revealing that *‘I think that they don’t want me , because [otherwise] there should be doing something that will make us together, I mean, gather us together (Student 2, England)* and explained that because they did not find universities to be spaces where pluralism was promoted, they, for instance, had to leave the campus ‘*because I am a Muslim, so it’s very difficult to find halal food and religious, like mosques and others, if you practise, you are religious, so that’s why I am living outside the campus’ (Student1, England).*

Other students were however more explicit in linking the perceived lack of reciprocity with their national identities and backgrounds, especially in the classroom, to what they saw were misconceptions about Anglophone students being better than ‘others’. They saw preferential treatment of international students from Anglophone countries to be a reflection of what Stein et al. (2016) conceptualise as a monocultural Western hegemony that prevents any alternative views from entering university classrooms. This was observed, for instance, by an international student in England who explained that tutors, home students and other Anglophone students would always present ‘*their own* *views’* on non-Anglophone issues, which were stereotypical and discrediting any possibilities of any alternatives ever being treated equally. The student found this situation distressing and said:

 I think they need to be realistic, people who give these presentations need to come down to earth [referring to tutors giving a lecture], and if they generalise, they need to do the kind of generalisation which doesn’t insult the other culture or which doesn’t look down on other cultures, and at the same time, it makes people aware that different kind of things can also be there [i.e. alternative views as equally valid] (Student 8, England)

The dominance of Anglophone views emerged particularly strongly in the German case. The accounts from the students below reveal subordination of non-Anglophone students’ voices to those from their Anglophone counterparts. Interestingly, this subordination appeared to be evolving not under conditions which created exclusion for non-Anglophone students because of their lack of ‘cultural’ fit with Germany, but it was rather based on classroom responses to non-Anglophone students which suggested that these students were marginalised (in Germany) because they were not bound to Anglophone nations, in cultural, language and citizenship terms. For example, two non-Anglophone students revealed the following:

The Germans want to know more about students who are English, or I don’t know, Canadian, but for the Italians, they are *just an international student*; not only the Italians but also South Korean, Chinese, *all the others*. (Student 2, Germany)

 S: I am attending a class, and there is an American girl, and her opinion is always important, her opinion counts a lot and I think they [tutors] are more interested maybe in her opinion.

 I: So how does that make you feel as the ‘other’ international student?

 S: Of course, you would like to be more considered, but they want to know more about the American culture than the European. (Student 5, Germany)

Similarly to students in England, the non-Anglophone students in Germany wanted to be considered as experts and were frustrated that their perspectives were discredited as valid on the basis that, for instance, they did not speak the native German language. One student said:

I am the expert, and if I speak better German or not, it doesn’t matter because the importance of the answer is that I know something that they don’t.(Student 1, Germany).

Another non-Anglophone student expressed a similar view and said that the preference for the Anglophone country perspective in the classroom discussions at their university was not justifiable because *‘we have a lot of new things to tell them and I can relate my country to their own country too’* (Student 3, Germany)

The account that follows offers particularly novel insights, showing how strongly the Anglophone norm was associated with internationalisation at the student’s university. The account from the student below, in combination with the quotes cited above, begins to shape a phenomenon in critical studies of internationalisation that could be termed as ‘*double-country oppression’. ‘Double country oppression’* draws attention to situations whereby international students are excluded not only on the basis of lacking characteristics that ‘bind’ them to the country of education but also (and perhaps primarily) because they lack characteristics that ‘bind’ them to Anglophone countries. These characteristics in the quote below include language and citizenship status.

During the course, I had a really bad situation with the teacher, she was giving attention only to American and Canadian students, without considering the others. During the course, the American and Canadian students did not say anything to other international students and the teacher said ‘Oh maybe because you don’t understand anything, so maybe this course is not for you’. So she made me feel like I was not at the level of the course. I felt excluded of course, because I never thought I was not at the level of the others! This teacher, throughout this course, always continued to have the same attitude, she always asked the American girl, the Canadian girl, let’s say, English speakers but the others, she didn’t really care. I was shocked because hm … it was the course for people who speak other languages so I thought that was the course that didn’t have to deal with those kind of issues (Student 4, Germany)

On the other hand, students in both countries whose teachers were equally inclusive of both Anglophone and non-Anglophone students enjoyed studying in multicultural environments, as *‘all the time we compare our culture with them (German and Anglophone students], and it’s beautiful (Student 3, Germany).* A student in England recalled that when ‘*everybody was equal… we all enjoyed our experience, we loved it because we felt that we existed there in the classroom!’ (Student 6, England).* The Anglophone domination and commercial priorities driving internationalisation however continued to feature strongly in students’ narratives, drawing additional attention to some ethical aspects that are discussed below.

***Stepping over some ethical questions***

The students were explicit about how they thought commercial priorities driving internationalisation played a role in the discrimination they reported they were facing. The students felt their ‘foreign’ status weakened their security and access to the same rights and benefits as national citizens. They also felt that despite knowing that international students’ ‘foreign’ status could affect their ability to access, for instance, accommodation outside the university campus, the universities did not want to tell them about it prior to their arrival in the country of education ‘*because for universities, you know, it’s like a business’. (Student4, Germany).* The student in England quoted below highlighted that ethical responsibilities are stepped over when commercial rationales behind internationalisation compete at the expense of social and moral responsibilities which universities should have towards international students. These, in the students’ view, included raising awareness about potential areas in which international students may face discrimination and secondly, for making it explicit to students how to protect themselves when they do.

Accommodation is a big deal, it can really make a big difference to the way the students see their life here, and it is the role of the university, the university should really make it clear to the students, and say ‘Listen this is the situation here’, because it can make a huge difference to their studies, and also to the way the students view the whole country, and its people, but they don’t want to take responsibility (…) There are some rights for the students here, but we are not aware of. They are written somewhere, but students need more guidance, at least in the first year, if this guidance is offered, then that’s it, students will understand” (Student 9, England)

In terms of further ethical implications, and also supporting earlier points about the framing of a ‘desired international student’, the account from the student below shows ways in which some localised institutional strategies that produced a hierarchical system of stratification of international students had been set in motion. The ‘Baden-Württemberg-Stipendium’ referred to by the student in the quote below is a scholarship programme available to all students wishing to undertake study abroad, yet, as it is revealed below, the case study university made it very explicit that they wanted to offer it to specific students:

 S:I feel that the professors and also the International Office focus more on students from the USA and they don’t focus much on the European. I kind of feel OK with that, because I guess they want to have good reputation.

 I: And can you think of a particular situation that made you feel this was the case?

 S: For example, in our documents, there was the Baden-Württemberg-Stipendium, and they wrote only for non-European students, but actually, Baden-Württemberg is also for European students so I was like ‘Why?” (Student 5, Germany)

Arguably, possible answers as to ‘why’ were captured in the analysis developed under the section ‘Double Country Oppression’. There are however far more reaching implications of these answers, in terms of the type of the theoretical meaning ‘Double country oppression’ may offer for critical studies of internationalisation. Uncovering this meaning requires a closer look at key understandings of internationalisation and to what extent they encompass issues related to epistemic democracy. A review of key ideas is presented below, additionally pointing to ways in which the key points about ‘double country oppression’ signalled in this paper may further our understanding of the sociology of internationalisation in non-Anglophone contexts.

**Internationalisation, Nation State and Epistemic Democracy**

The most commonly accepted definition of internationalisation of higher education is probably the one proposed over a decade ago by Jane Knight. This definition denotes internationalisation as ‘the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education (Knight, 2004, p. 11). Various aspects of Knight’s definition have since been developed in research on internationalisation (e.g. Gao, 2018; Lau & Lin, 2017; Healey, 2017). Of specific relevance to this paper however is work that has focused on misconceptions about what internationalisation is (De Wit, 2011). These misconceptions include ideas that internationalisation, for instance, means teaching in the English language, that it reflects a desire to increase student mobility , or strives to include more internationally focused curricula and is driven by increased recruitment of international students (ibid). Whilst all these are aspects of internationalisation, achieving these should not be mistaken for end goals of internationalisation. When viewed as such, it would mean that internationalisation is perceived in terms of ‘inputs and outputs’ and pragmatic activities towards institutional goals, which consequently misrepresent the original meaning of internationalisation developed by Knight as a process of integration that is constantly evolving (Knight, 2004, 2014).

Most of these misinterpretations can also be misleading. Increased recruitment of international students, for instance, additionally fueled by the influence from commercial rankings (Hazelkorn, 2015; Lynch, 2015), has led to situations which enabled universities to be declared as ‘internationalised’ without actually having to embody any form of democratic commitment to international students (Hayes & Cheng, 2018). It has also been argued elsewhere that due to the fact that, presently, internationalisation is measured in structural terms (for instance based on home-international student ratios and internationally co-authored publications), more reciprocal engagement with international students does not happen naturally (e.g. Spencer-Oatey & Dauber, 2015). Subsequently, it has additionally been noted that even universities with the most conservative cultures and deficit-oriented views towards international students can be assessed as highly internationalised (Hayes & Cheng, 2018).

There are therefore ways in which it is possible to argue that the very existence, prominence and powerful role of ranking assessments in determining reputational gains for universities (Hazelkorn, 2015), as well as the increasing influence of misconceptions about internationalisation that often drives the nature and scope of internationalisation developments at national and institutional levels (Seeber et al, 2016), may prevent what Hudzik (2011) terms ‘comprehensive internationalisation’. Hudzik (2011) defines comprehensive internationalisation as ‘a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives through teaching, research and service missions of higher education [which] will shape institutional ethos and values [*not activities or hard outcomes* - my emphasis] and touches the entire higher education enterprise’ (Hudzik, 2011, p. 6). But it is not difficult to see how universities’ commitment to embrace inter-epistemic conversations may by affected under the current influence of reputational rankings and misconceptions about internationalisation, as under their current shape and nature, universities do not actually have to subscribe to this commitment, to be officially declared as international. Gorski (2008) has argued that universities simply do not subscribe to it because this is not what is measured. Consequently, it is therefore possible to also see how the conditions for epistemic equality of international students that have emerged as an issue in this research may be undermined by these rankings. Combined with the various misconceptions surrounding internationalisation listed above (especially those associated with the English language), it is legitimate to further argue that those rankings could have also created the conditions for exclusion of those who are *globally less relevant* (i.e. non-Anglophone – for analysis, see for example Stein et al [2016] or Altbach & Knight [2007]).

Thus*, global relevance*, understood in term of being and becoming like the Western (Anglophone) countries, in the sense of acquiring the same pathways of knowledge, content of curricula and language of instruction (e.g. Stein et al, 2016), is an important factor affecting epistemic equality. Defined as classroom activism towards ending subordination of those who have been described as non-people, inferiors, primitives and barbarians (mainly because they were non-Anglophone and non-European) (Mignolo, 2009), epistemic equality rests around ideas of inter-epistemic dialogue - that is, interactions that emphasise the difference between participants as sources of critical knowledge ‘by making visible co-existing paradigms of thought that have been silenced and disavowed’ (Aman, 2018, p. 89). Epistemic equality denotes the view that coloniality – i.e. the logic of cultural and intellectual domination over foreign students in an education system (Ghiso & Campano, 2013) has historically hidden, silenced and forced-itself upon cultures that are less globally relevant (Aman, 2018). Universities therefore need to work towards institutional epistemic justice (Anderson, 2012) whereby they get to the point of actively seeking epistemic democracy. This means that need to routinely and officially practise ‘universal participation on terms of equality of all inquirers’ (Anderson, 2012, p. 172).

Thus, when epistemic democracy is understood as classroom activism, through adequate pedagogies, which emphasises that knowledge can be produced by *all* people, rather than being a product of a particular place and particular people, it prevents the type of ‘dehumanisation’ which has emerged in this research - i.e. in terms of whose knowledge is desired and accepted as valid and whose not. What is especially important is that prevention of such dehumanisation should not happen through a sudden and reactional introduction of classroom activities to *overemphasise* the identities of those who were oppressed in ways revealed by the students in this research. There is a risk that this overemphasis would only create more misconceptions about internationalisation as an ‘integrational process’ and could instead position it as a deliberate institutional strategy. Rather, dehumanisation should be reduced by the intention to also liberate the host universities and teachers from the ways through which they may (perhaps even unintentionally) have come to oppress the ‘other’ in the first instance (Freire, 1970). These ways could be related to their histories, which subsequently allowed them to assume positions of prestige and superiority (e.g. Lomer, 2016), current public discourses about international students within the boundaries of their state (e.g. Schartner & Cho, 2017) or above all, as has been shown in the analysis section, the global trend of homogenisation of the sources of knowledge produced by misconceptions about internationalisation.

Liberation of the ‘oppressed’ and the ‘oppressor’ could therefore be achieved through commitment under internationalisation to the process of re-framing social relations, forms of knowledge and culture of universities in ways that accept all foreigners in the classroom as equals. But this commitment has to be driven by internationalisation rationales to achieve justice, equality, plurality, liberty and reciprocal recognition of ‘other’ within national universities (Parker, 2004), as opposed to political, economic and reputational priorities that have been found to presently drive internationalisation (e.g. Seeber at al, 2016 or Gao, 2018). The former is however unlikely to happen, unless epistemic and social justice rationales are supported by the political power, manifested in adequate cross-border and universal education policies that include internationalisation as one of the determinants of teaching excellence (Hayes & Cheng, 2018).

For the time being, however, the benefits of ‘knowledges’ gained from cross-border people are likely to remain unavailable to host country students and institutions. Marginson (2018) for instance argues that under circumstances when political and economic goals are driving internationalisation, host country individuals lack agency to engage with internationally mobile people on more reciprocal terms, as representations and public discourses that surround international students construct them as economic objects; a representation which consequently challenges their intellectual value. Host country individuals therefore do not see any benefits of epistemic equality. Rather, as shown elsewhere in literature on home and international student experiences and internationalisation at home (for latest review see Harrison, 2015), they are likely to disengage with the ‘other’ and continue to subordinate them in the education system because, by virtue of being the host, countries are in a position to dictate conditions for ‘conditional equality’ - meaning that ‘others’ can also be equal provided they adopt the same ways of being and learning that are practised by the host (da Silva, 2015). Such situations reinforce representations of the hosts, particularly the Anglophone ones, as superior and international students as lacking moral and intellectual capacity (da Silva, 2015). They therefore ‘undermine the epistemic standing of the disadvantaged and block the contribution to inquiry they could have made, had they been able to participate on terms of equality with others’ (Anderson, 2012, p. 171).

Another misconception about internationalisation that leads to these situations is one which assumes that internationalisation will happen naturally and does not need to be encouraged (for critique, see De Wit [2011] or Fallis [2009]). In itself, this misconception stems from another misconception about internationalisation - namely, that acknowledgement of different geopolitics of knowledge, through the activity of making the curriculum more internationally-focused, will also happen naturally. This misconception has been critiqued in various works on internationalisation of the curriculum, internationalisation at home and cosmopolitanism in education, pointing to the need for an active and firm agenda to lead a more progressive engagement with international people (Leask & Bridge, 2013; Leask & Carroll, 2011, Rizvi 2009). The misconception which assumes that acknowledgement of different geopolitics of knowledge will happen naturally also ignores analyses which point out that internationalisation’s long connection to imperialism and the nation state create a tension with respect to international students as credible inquirers or ‘knowers’ (e.g. Fallis, 2009). Rather, it has been argued that the imperial connections make home students and university tutors colonised in mind and practice (Gorki, 2009; Tickly, 2004).

But what is particularly interesting is that the type of ‘othering’ of non-Anglophone students that emerged in this research in the context of the German case did not appear to be driven by any symbolic allegiances to the German nation state. Rather, those who were marginalised were excluded because they did not share the national and cultural characteristics of the Anglophone students. This observation carries significant implications for our understanding of internationalisation developments in non-Anglophone countries, as the observation that the need for the Anglophone ‘match’ was located within the boundaries of a non-Anglophone state draws attention to a possible relevance of concepts such as ‘double-country oppression’. The emergence of ‘double-country’ oppression in this paper points to a theoretically significant overlay of the global and the local, in the sense that internationalisation does not appear to be realised in specific forms that are local but rather appears to be a universal phenomenon that challenges the view on internationalisation as a country specific product (e.g. for some analyses see Enders (2004) and Buckner (2017). Instead, the nature of this overlay seems to reproduce already established power-relations globally and subscribes to the idea of allegiance to them via uniformity and homogenisation of sources of valid knowledge.

Thus, cultural differences and national contexts only seem to matter insofar attempts to create a public discourse about internationalisation are made, as despite academic literature pointing out that specific in-country visions can influence how internationalisation is realised at local levels (e.g. Bedenlier, 2017), such insights do not seem to have many practical implications in light of the findings that emerged in this study. This challenges the adequacy of the nation-state perspectives in understanding internationalisation developments, concurring with existing research, for example, by Yang (2014) who argues that despite political, cultural and identity tensions between China and Anglophone countries, China still signs up to match as many of the Anglophone characteristics as possible because these are the only ones that are currently recognised through current (mis) understandings of practice, articulation and realisation of internationalisation. Writing specifically about the context of the UK and Germany, Graf (2009) has also critiqued the idea of the influence of the nation state and instead pointed out that, despite ideological differences in rationales behind internationalisation at the level of each of these nation states, the actual articulation of internationalisation is mainly driven by market expansionism and pragmatic benefits associated with homogenisation and uniformity of knowledge. Building on this work, the emergence of ‘double country oppression’ in this paper therefore challenges the idea that there are new possibilities for epistemic democracy as more non-Anglophone states enter the internationalisation competition. The paper therefore makes important contributions to critical sociology of internationalisation which are summarised in the conclusion.

**Conclusion**

In an answer to the research questions in this paper about the extent to which commitment to realising international students as epistemic equals constitutes internationalisation at the case study universities in the UK and Germany, the paper has shown that this commitment is rather poor. The analysis has identified situations that step over some ethical questions and identified a new area of critical sociology of internationalisation which focuses on the ways in which non-Anglophone countries may be putting international students at risk of ‘double-country oppression’. There are therefore practical and theoretical implications of this paper that should be developed in future research, especially that the samples used in this study were only small. The novel insights provided here call into question arguments suggesting that factors affecting epistemic democracy are mainly nation-state specific. The comparison between the UK and Germany revealed that despite two different nation-states (with different public discourses about international students) engaging in internationalisation, the relations of power stay the same as those who have been muted in the Anglophone context have also been muted in the same ways, and for the same reasons (i.e. through the lack of cultural and legal boundedness to Anglophone countries), in the non-Anglophone context. Such findings contribute to critical sociology of internationalisation in that they point out ways in which non-Anglophoneinternational students may become more vulnerable to betrayal even in non-Anglophone contexts, as misconceptions of internationalisation analysed in the section preceding this conclusion make ‘double-country oppression’ legitimate and justified. The analysis in the paper therefore highlights that we should exercise caution in making arguments about changing imaginaries of internationalisation and greater opportunities for epistemic democracy as new (non-Anglophone) countries engage in internationalisation. This last point requires careful scrutiny in future research, examining how the interface between different knowledge systems and inter-epistemic dialogue may be influenced by the globally established socio-political relations that affect opportunities for production and acceptance of different knowledges.
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**Appendix 1**

Table 1 below presents codes that emerged in the process of data analysis. All interviews were transcribed verbatim and were analysed using the following three-stage approach:

1) The first stage involved ‘open coding’ – i.e. identifying distinct concepts of relevance to the research (larger chunks of raw data) and labelling them with key words or phrases.

2) The second stage involved ‘axial coding’ – i.e. a process of relating the open codes to each other and forming them into categories of significance to the research.

3) The final, third stage involved ‘selective coding’ – i.e. a process of selecting the core category that accounts for most of the variation of data captured by the categories from axial coding. The author coded each transcript individually and then regularly compared their open, axial and selective codes recorded for each transcript, as well as returning to previously coded data. This process added methodological rigour to the analysis and ensured that the main arguments in the paper were driven by the data.

Following this inductive approach, the selective codes pointed the author in the direction of possible theoretical frameworks to analyse the conceptual implications of the data and these are outlined in column 4 (‘Theoretical Framework’) in Table 1.

*Table 1: Summary of open, axial and selective codes as well as theoretical frameworks that emerged in the analysis of data.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Examples of Open Codes**  | **Axial Codes** | **Selective Codes**  | **Theoretical Framework**  |
| ‘I think that they don’t want me’‘the kind of generalisation which doesn’t insult the other culture’‘because I am a Muslim’‘it makes people aware that different kind of things can also be there’‘we loved it because we felt that we existed there in the classroom’ | ‘lack of reciprocity with student identities’‘monocultural education’‘no commitment to international students as people in their own right’ | lack of epistemic democracy  | misconceptions about internationalisation (De Wit, 2011; Knight, 2014, Hudzik, 2011) and its referents (Hazelkorn, 2015; Lynch, 2015) - their impact on misconceptions that epistemic democracy will happen naturally ( Dahl, 2000; Fallis, 2009)  |
| ‘The Germans want to know more about students who are English’‘I feel that the professors and also the International Office focus more on students from the USA’‘there is an American girl, and her opinion is always important, her opinion counts a lot and I think they are more interested maybe in her opinion’ ‘you would like to be more considered, but they want to know more about the American culture’ | ‘dominant Anglophone view/ characteristics’, exclusion through country characteristics’‘exclusion through Anglophone characteristics’ | Double-country oppression  | Signification of Anglophone students vs. non-Anglophone students in terms of whose knowledge is accepted as valid and whose views are silenced (Stein et al, 2016; Gorksi, 2008; Mignolo, 2009; Aman, 2018)validity of nation-state based theoretical lenses in analysing developments in internationalisation (especially in terms of realisation of international students as epistemic equals - Gorski, 2008; Aman, 2018; Mignolo, 2009). *Key contribution of the paper* - ‘double country oppression’ as an emerging phenomenon in critical sociology of internationalisation (especially in non-Anglophone countries)  |
| ‘because for universities, you know, it’s like a business’‘they don’t want to take responsibility (…) There are some rights for the students here, but we are not aware of.’‘there was the Baden-Württemberg-Stipendium, and they wrote only for non-European students, but actually, Baden-Württemberg is also for European students’ | ‘commercialised approaches to internationalisation’‘manipulation of local strategies’‘laws and regulations’.  | stepping over some ethical questions  |
| **Open, axial and selective codes not included in the paper**  |
| ‘trying to push myself to speak English all the time’‘when I first encountered food, I mean, like here, it was really awful’‘we don’t get like lectures and seminars before, so it’s like a brand new way of learning for me’‘when I first came here it was so difficult. I remember standing at the airport and I cried for two or three more hours maybe’  | ‘coping when living away from home’ | ‘everyday’ alienation  | n/a, given the research questions of this paper  |
| ‘in the end, I really enjoyed university life here, I mean in both, in an academic way and in social ways’ ‘sometimes you don’t really know how to speak but then you learn how to speak in front of the whole class’‘I have learnt a lot of things from people in this university, from people in the local area’ with friends, it was so difficult, they also didn’t understand me, so in the beginning it was really challenging for me’  | ‘transformations of identity’  | succeeding against the odds  | n/a, given the research questions of this paper  |