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Abstract

ANNE BENTLEY

‘MY BLOOD IS IN IT’: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL DOCTORAL STUDENTS’ EMBODIED EXPERIENCE OF A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

Reflecting its Cartesian underpinnings, academic scholarship privileges discourse over embodiment, resulting in a lack of research about international doctoral students' bodily experience of Higher Education. International students represent a significant income stream for UK universities and offer the opportunity for the meeting of different cultures, minds and bodies. Using phenomenological theory and taking embodiment as its starting point, this thesis explores the implicit dimensions of international doctoral students' everyday experience of campus. Walking interviews, photo-elicitation and semi-structured interviews with eight international doctoral students yielded embodied, visual and discursive methods. Merleau-Ponty, Ahmed and Arendt were used to theorise the interrelated embodied, material, social and political phenomenology of campus. Being-in-campus extended and interrupted students. When international doctoral students were extended, being-in-campus inspired creativity and imagination which they used to construct their identities, evoke a politics of place and buffer the effects of cultural disorientation. When international doctoral students were interrupted, their scope for agency, identity and social space was restricted, positioning them outside of mainstream social life. Fellow international
students embodied familiarity enabling friendships across nationalities and ethnicities. Students' bodily experiences disclosed the intertwining of person, place, society and politics and the importance of embodied familiarity and embodied particularity to social inclusion. By not attending to students' embodied experience, institutions risk reproducing conditions of exclusion. Philosophically this thesis shows the utility of Merleau-Ponty's body schema with its focus on embodied familiarity and the importance of Ahmed and Arendt to show how dominant groups shape the social and political space available for minority groups. The thesis suggests that international doctoral students' social exclusion is an ethical issue and poses questions about how we live alongside different people in relationships that recognise and respect our common humanity. It argues that universities, as centres of thought, are ideal sites to address this ethical task.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

In this section I show how I derived my research question and focus. I set out the importance of international students to Higher Education and explain how the monetisation of their bodies has served to conceal their human individuality from public discourse. I discuss how international doctoral students' invisibility is further brought into focus through socio-political factors, such as migration policy and racism, and address a consistently cited need to focus on the particularity of students embodied experience in campus. Finally, I contextualise the research, describing Port City campus and delineating the wider material, social and political environment within which the research will take place.

Deriving the research focus.

In 2016, my research into international students' use of university counselling services (UKCISA, 2016) uncovered the complexity of their relationships with other students and with university wellbeing services. The emotional content of their testimonies disclosed embodied and cultural aspects of experience and place that I was interested to research further. As a child I had lived overseas and, after university, I worked as an English teacher in Japan. These experiences of living away from home engendered a lifelong interest in the experience of living in a foreign country and in cross cultural connections between place and people. For these academic and personal reasons, I was keen maintain this focus for my doctorate.

At a doctoral supervision session, my supervisor related how he knew of a group of international students who returned to a specific café at the same time, every day. This intrigued me. I wondered what function that café was serving for those
international students and about the importance of those habits? I reflected on how that café (material) in that city (place and space) seemed to inspire embodied routines (personal). This led me to think about the students' purpose in coming to Port City to study and of the possible significance of Port City campus as both an 'intellectual home' (Thody, 2011, p. 127) and a social environment. The materiality and physicality of place evokes feelings and behaviours (Gieryn, 2000) and I was curious as to whether students’ experience of the physical space influenced their relationship and sense of belonging to the university (Habel and Whitman, 2016). I was interested to discover how students felt about the campus and whether there were links to wider socio-political aspects of being an international student in campus. It is suggested that a university space can represent and exemplify its ideals (Ossa-Richardson, 2016) and that buildings can materially represent and influence the wider social context (Lefebvre, 1991; Jones, 2009; van Leeuwen, B., 2021) and the practices of those using them. I wanted to explore the impact of these material structures on students' everyday practices, aware that places could include and exclude, extend and limit the people who use them (Warren, 2017; Ahmed, 2006).

I decided to research Port City campus as a point of entry into the figurative, embodied, social and emotional experience of international students and was interested in learning about how the material environment affected their lived experience as minority bodies. I chose to research international doctoral students as the length of doctoral study requires a commitment to living in Port City for an extended period of time and offered a more sustained engagement with campus than for students studying for shorter periods. I defined international students as any student who had left their homeland to study at Port University.
The significance of international students to universities.

At the time of the research in 2019, the international student market was flourishing, with HESA (2019) data recording yearly increases since 2013 in the number of non-UK students studying in the UK. Adams (2019), drawing on UCAS data, reported that the ‘record numbers’ of applications to UK universities from students from China and Hong Kong had exceeded the number of applicants from Wales. This upward trend continued with 2021-2022, seeing a 13% rise in the numbers of international students studying in the UK from the previous year (UKCISA, 2023). This included an increase in postgraduate numbers which accounted for 64% of postgraduate full-time students in the UK (UKCISA, 2023).

Unlike home student tuition fees, international student fees are unregulated, allowing for universities to offset the impacts of domestic student fee regulation, decreasing governmental subsidies and grants, and increasing running costs, by charging international students higher fees than home students. International students therefore offer a significant economic benefit to UK universities, with international tuition fee income increasing by 167 per cent between 2009-10 and 2019-20, from £2.2 billion to £5.9 billion (OfS, 2022). Tuition fees for international students vary depending upon institution. In 2023, a doctorate in Education at Port City cost home students £4,500 a year and international students £17,170 for a Band 2 full time doctorate or £13,645 for a Band 1 (Port City, 2023). The disparity in tuition fees between home and international students across institutions can range between 37% - 500% (Scott and Mhunpiew, 2021). Without this fee income, researchers at the Institute of Fiscal Studies have suggested that UK universities may be 'imperilled' (Britton, Drayton & van der Erve, 2020). The buoyancy of the international student
market suggests that international students could be critical to UK universities' future profitability and sustainability, and whilst the UK currently appears to be in a strong position in terms of attracting international applicants, there is global competition for international student fee revenue.

**Rationale for the research**

Researchers have expressed concerns that the drive for more international students can result in their bodies being seen primarily in monetary terms (Waters, 2020; Tannock, 2016; Choudaha, 2017). International students have been described as ‘cash cows’ (Diamantopoulos, 2002; Haugh, 2008; Robertson, 2011) a term which obscures their humanity and bodily particularity, rendering their bodies invisible (Waters, 2020, 2021). This discursive invisibility operated alongside a lack of attention to the unique quality of international students ‘experience in the UK (Pagliarello et al., 2023; Hopwood and Paulson, 2012). International students through their bodily presence, intellectual, social and cultural resources, have the potential to alter and enrich universities academically, socially and culturally, yet this remains unfulfilled, due to the gap between the institutional drives for globalisation and the comparative lack of detailed attention paid to, ‘the conditions of encounter and learning’ (Sidhu et al., 2016, p. 1511) that happen in the multiple spaces across campus. A detailed focus on students’ experience of Port City campus could contribute to this knowledge gap.

**International students' bodies**

The continuing popularity of UK universities to the international student market would seem to suggest that the Higher Education sector is 'getting it right' in terms of its
offering to international students. However, international students face a complex set of social conditions that point to an ambivalent response to their presence in the UK. Whilst courted by universities for their fees, international students are simultaneously positioned by the UK government as part of a wider migration discourse. As international students fall within net migration figures, they have been assimilated into governmental narratives around the need to reduce immigration (Malik, 2023; Syal, 2023). In May 2023, to address rising immigration figures, Home Secretary, Suella Braverman, announced that from January 2024, the number of dependents allowed to accompany international students would be restricted. Whilst this will not apply to doctoral students, the proposal publicly and discursively constructed international students as a problem for the economy and as a cause of intolerably high migration (Malik, 2023). The association of international students with undesirable immigration is not recent: in 2018 Waters suggested that public understanding of international education is tied in with concerns over immigration and, by implication, the consumption of UK economic resources by non-nationals. ¹

Research suggests that international students are likely to be from minority ethnic groups and at greater risk of racism than white students, with 24% students from an minority ethnic background reporting racial harassment since starting their course, compared to 9% of white students (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2019). An earlier study found that of the 153 international postgraduate students questioned, 49 had experienced some form of racist abuse (Brown and Jones, 2013).

¹ Far from draining the UK economy, in 2021/22 international students benefitted the economy by £41.9 bn and every 11 non-EU students created £1m worth of net economic impact in the UK (Canings, Halterbeck and Conlon, 2023).
International students who experienced racial harassment felt excluded, had experienced racial micro-aggressions and racist abuse, with the majority (77%) not reporting it to their university (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2019). Given this under-reporting tendency (Shaw et al., 2019; the Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2019; NUS, 2012), reported figures are likely to underestimate the problem. Both racism and migration narratives obscure the bodies of students positioning them as ‘other’. This is mirrored in the social positioning of international students who report difficulties in forming bonds with home students (Herman and Meki Kombe 2019; McMahon, 2018; Pham and Tran, 2015). Waters (2020) argues that this cannot be seen as othering, as being othered requires first being seen, suggesting that the invisibility of international students' bodies pervades the social as well as political space.

Bengsten and Barnett (2017) develop a concept of narrative ‘darkness’ to denote the non-rational, non-conceptual, less positive discourses and experiences connected to higher education and use this idea to understand what is often the overlooked or ignored in higher education. Discursive invisibility, being constructed as politically undesirable, being associated with minoritized others and experiences of racism all point to difficult aspects of being an international doctoral student in the UK. As suggested, universities have paid insufficient attention to the quality of international doctoral students' daily life in place (Pagliarello et al., 2023; Hopwood and Paulson, 2012; Sidhu et al., 2016) and to the effects of whiteness on international doctoral students in the UK, particularly in comparison to the body of research in the US (Lin, 2019; Joshi, Chan & Graham, 2021; Anandavalli, Borders & Kniffin, 2021). Using the concept of darkness may encourage thinking about how universities may
unintentionally be sites of harm and wounding, particularly for students who exist under the radar, whose human particularity is rendered invisible to others or whose bodies attract hostility. Exploring these aspects requires researchers to, ‘to feel into things, to be at one with things anew’ (Bengsten and Barnett, 2017, p. 126). By feeling and dwelling imaginatively with the ‘dark spots and blind angles’ (p.116) and by having the courage to engage imaginatively with suffering and other forms of darkness or unseen experience, researchers can develop a new vision to identify, and engage with experience not easily explained through mainstream professional discourses and agendas (Bengsten and Barnett, 2017). The concept of dark spots includes informal and extra curricula learning spaces (Elliott et al., 2016) as they are a critical part of wider doctoral learning. Engaging with this kind of educational darkness could cultivate professional imagination, creativity and develop more subtle and nuanced ways of understanding the student experience, beyond conventional professionalization, quality assurance or other 'official' discourses. The concept of educational darkness would align with phenomenology’s aim of accessing the implicit, often hidden aspects of daily experience and conceptually it invites the researcher to summon courage to dwell with, and reflect upon, the less comfortable aspects of international doctoral students' experience with a view to situating these into a wider and more nuanced understanding of university life on campus.

Attending to the potential bodily impacts of racism and social exclusion as they manifest in students' relationship with campus offers an opportunity to surface detailed accounts of embodiment arising within an educational context not known for focusing on students' bodily particularity (Hopwood and Paulson, 2012; Ozolins, 2013; Lelwica, 2009). University education is driven by economic incentives and
consists of ‘individual, cognitive-technical practice’ (Tsouroufli, 2015, p. 3) which organises and constructs knowledge acquisition as a fundamentally disembodied process. I challenge the idea of human experience, knowledge production and academic progress as occurring solely as a result of mental activity (Stoltz, 2015; Shapiro and Stolz, 2018), regard the mind-world-body relationship as intertwined (Merleau-Ponty, 2012) and suggest that the body has the potential to 'open up' and disclose nuanced and 'differential' aspects of the students' experience (Khatun, French & Smith, 2021. p. 1). Paying attention to students’ embodiment may uncover pre-reflective meanings that have not yet been translated or filtered into words (Finlay, 2011) and may be important in surfacing tacit or unspoken aspects of experience, including 'dark' places (Bengsten and Barnett, 2017).

**Context of the research: Port City University**

At the time of the research in 2019, 225 out of the 621 doctoral students at Port City University were international students (36%), below the national figure of 42% (HESA, 2023a). 40% of home doctoral students and 13% of international doctoral students defined themselves as white (Port University information services, 2017). In the wider context of Port City University, 69.5% of postgraduate students and 84.3% of undergraduate students defined themselves as white indicating that black minority ethnic students were a significant minority across the university. Literal and figurative effects of ‘whiteness’ (Ahmed, 2007) and of being a minority (Arendt, 1963, 1958) are discussed in Chapter 2.

In the 1990s, Port City campus was based across several geographic locations, some of which were a considerable distance from Port City. By 2007, it had centralised its campus in the heart of Port City and in the process, structurally
changed how interactions across different schools and faculties could happen. By bringing more students on to a centralised campus, the social environment was expanded suggesting a role for the space of campus to define and create conditions for different forms of professional and social interaction (Jandric and Loretto, 2020). To accommodate the centralisation, it redeveloped and refurbished the library, upgraded many laboratory and teaching facilities and built a state-of-the-art building for its civil engineering, coastal engineering, and marine science courses. The campus developed a public theatre, cinema space, rehearsal studios, digital media suites and a public art gallery. It remains a site of change, and during my time as a member of staff (2010-2021) there were constant major building works happening across campus and an atmosphere of growth and aspiration. The campus has little green space, apart from a small recently renovated park near a reservoir and is dominated by concrete buildings. The campus is in the heart of the city, next to shops and entertainments. Students can easily access civic and university amenities on foot and the non-teaching rooms of campus and its cafes are open to the public. This positions academic and social life as connected, happening within a small geographical space and Port Campus and City as part of each other. Given the permeable nature of campus and city and their geographical embeddedness, my research will include both city and campus-based experiences to accommodate the ‘flows’ between them (Massey, 2005) and flag up any potential differentiation in lived experience between the two.

**Port City**

Port City is located in the southwest of England. It was one of the most bombed cities in England during the Blitz in World War 2, with much of the city destroyed
(anonymised, 2008). In the 1990s it experienced rapid economic decline, largely due to high unemployment and loss of industry. Lack of investment in the city contributed to creating areas of extreme deprivation (PortCity.gov, 2003). Whilst there are plans for its regeneration, Port City contains high levels of social inequality. Compared to the national average, child poverty is higher, more children live in deprived areas and fewer children access higher education at age nineteen (anonymised, 2016). Over 90% of Port City’s population are white (Census, 2011). The economic regeneration of Port City is hampered by poor access to the city from other parts of the country as it does not have an airport.

In 2016, 3 years before the research was conducted, Britain voted to leave the European Union. The main issues of the Brexit campaign were border controls and immigration policy (Hobolt, 2016; Schmidtke, 2021) and reflected popular concerns over the number of EU migrants entering the UK and a perception that EU legislation meant that national sovereignty was compromised through having to apply legislation from Brussels (Travers, 2016). In 2016, 59.9% of voters in Port City voted to leave the European Union (BBC). It is possible that the intersection between lack of diversity in the population, poverty and lack of occupational and educational opportunity in Port City may contribute to a lack of experience of engaging with people from different social and ethnic groups. The strength of local support for Brexit could suggest that information about non-UK people may have been derived more from dominant political narratives and discourses about ‘out of control’ immigration (voteleavetakecontrol.org), as opposed to real life encounters.

Since the Brexit vote in 2016 to 2022, reports of hate crime in Port City have increased (anonymised, 2022) reflecting a national picture of a year-on-year increase
in hate crimes (Heald et al., 2018; Home Office, 2016). In 2015/16 there were 45,440 incidences of race hate crime in the England and Wales, rising to 76,070 in 2019/20 (Home Office, 2020). Anti-Asian discrimination in the UK has risen steadily (Smith, 2021; Matzuda, 2021) and is ‘disproportionately felt by international students' (Frampton, Smith and Smithies, 2022, p. 37). Economic and social deprivation can cause alienation from other social groups, resulting in a retreat into a small group identity and an unwillingness to engage with diverse others and diverse outlooks (Magne, 2019; Watt, 2006).

Whilst it is positive that people feel able to report increasing instances of hate crime to the police, minority ethnic people’s confidence in the police to respond sensitively and effectively may be influenced by a historical legacy of troubled relations between the British police and minority ethnic people. In 1999, the McPherson (McPherson, 1999) report into the death of Steven Lawrence concluded that the Metropolitan Police Service was institutionally racist and tasked it to adopt a zero-tolerance stance towards racism, develop more culturally sensitive procedures and form better relationships with minority ethnic groups. Over twenty-three years later, the UK police are still subject to similar criticism for practices that appear to prejudice black people, such as disproportionate stop and search policies (Dodd, 2021). In 2022 a Police Race Action Plan (NPCC, 2022) was created to increase black people’s ‘lower levels of trust and confidence’ and reduce the ‘race disparities' that the police were unable to account for (www.college.police.uk, 2022). The Casey review of the Metropolitan Police Service (Casey, 2023) made ‘a finding of institutional racism, sexism and homophobia’ in the Metropolitan Police Service.
These aspects of Port City, alongside the wider national picture, point to potentially difficult relationships with people from other countries and with black people and the national picture suggests low confidence in the police and universities to tackle racism. City and campus are both white contexts where minority ethnic international doctoral students are few in number, and my research will be sensitive to participants’ perceptions of how this plays out in their daily lives.

**Research Aims**

To address the lack of scholarly focus on international doctoral students’ bodies in narratives about their educational experience

To explore embodiment and its significance to international doctoral students’ perceptions of campus and city.

To attend to the qualities of international doctoral students’ everyday life in campus to surface detailed, nuanced understanding about their experience

To counter discourses that define international doctoral students through their monetary value to universities or construct them as in deficit relative to the host culture (see Chapter 2).

To identify ways to improve the quality of international doctoral students’ lives on campus and celebrate their contribution to the University.

**The Research Question**

Main research question:

How do international doctoral students experience the Port City campus?
Sub-questions:

How does campus affect students' bodies?

What are the personal, social and political dimensions of students' experience of campus?
Reader’s Guide

Chapter 2 sets out my research’s underpinning phenomenological theoretical framework, showing how it supports and extends the research question. I explore international students’ different forms of mobilities, theorise how campus space is produced and affirm the centrality of the body to experience.

Chapter 3 describes how I developed my methods, showing how they align with phenomenology and discusses their strengths and weaknesses. I describe and justify my approach to the research and clearly set out my methodological steps. I examine my ethical considerations and identify strengths and limitations.

Chapter 4 details and interprets my findings, showing how being in campus and city can extend and interrupt participants’ experience. When campus extended participants, they were able to generate new knowledge and find community. Experience of campus enabled a form of cultural critique, and by focusing on campus, the research illustrated the entwine ment of the personal, material and political. When participants were interrupted in campus and city, they encountered others’ negative constructions of their bodies and experienced bodily negation.

Chapter 5 discusses the body politics of space and how participants scope for social action can be restricted when they are not seen and not invited to share a social world with the majority group. Drawing on Arendt (1958, 1963) I discuss the consequences of social exclusion.

Chapter 6 returns to the research questions and evaluates the significance of campus and of prioritising embodiment. I draw conclusions and detail my contribution
to knowledge. I discuss the limitations of the research and explore directions for future research.
Chapter 2 - Theoretical positioning and Literature Review

Introduction
This chapter addresses how my phenomenological theoretical framework integrates with the research question. I discuss how notions of space and place illustrate the inherent mobilities represented by Port Campus and the individual, social and political aspects of international doctoral students' experience of Port Campus. I examine the literature surrounding different facets of international doctoral student mobility, conceiving of mobility as a back-and-forth process of place creation that situates the students' bodies as part of, and indivisible from, the wider world. Students come to Port University and bring their past experiences with them, which they draw on to understand and shape their experience in the present. Continuing the theme of mobility, I look at academic identity, mobility and the academic and social challenges of becoming doctoral. I then turn to a neglected area of research, that of the body, and seek to centre concepts of embodiment in framing international doctoral bodies academic and social relations. Finally, I highlight the tension inherent in being a minority ethnic body in a white context.

Theoretical Framework
A phenomenological approach is suitable for researching international doctoral students' experience of campus, as it enables a close attention to the implicit, pre-
reflective, embodied aspects of everyday life that can tend to be overlooked. Merleau-Ponty’s (2012) thinking about people’s relationship both to the world and to others foregrounds embodied experience, which supports the focus of my research. I outline the theory of the body schema and show how it drives and exemplifies our being-in-the world with others and then, drawing on Ahmed (2007) and Lewis (2018), I address a critique of the body schema which suggests that it neither addresses an ontology of difference nor adequately depicts the experience of racist oppression on the body. I link the theory to the research question throughout. Finally, I draw upon Arendt (1958, 1963, 1973, 1994) to theorise the political implications of living alongside others and the importance of agency as founded upon ‘appearing’ to others. These perspectives offer complementary ways of thinking about the individual, social and political dimensions of students’ experience of campus.

Why phenomenology? A brief rationale

Phenomenology challenges Cartesian dualism, which conceives of the subject (person) as synonymous with mind, where the person (fundamentally internal, mental) is in some kind of relationship, often problematically conceived, with an external, physical, body and world (Mehta, 2011). This mind-body split is a form of ontological dualism. In contrast, phenomenology seeks meaning in the material, embodied and figural aspects of the places we inhabit (van Manen, 2007) and stresses the entwining of mind-body-world which makes it ideally suited to a study of how doctoral students perceive the material world of campus.

My thesis will take an embodied approach to participants’ experiences, largely drawing on Merleau-Ponty (2012) as he emphasises pre-perceptual bodily experience, to disclose perception about a neglected area of research: how campus
affects international doctoral students' bodies (Hernandez, 2021). By foregrounding embodiment, I will explore felt and imagined aspects of participants' worldly, perceptual experience.

Merleau-Ponty views the self and the world as part of a continuum and argues for the centrality of the body to all experiencing. The body is present not as another ‘thing’ in the world but is our perspective on the world. Having a body not only provides our view of the world but is the only way that we can perceive the world (Zahavi, 2019). Merleau-Ponty argues that the world presents itself to our bodies and we perceive it in the way that we do, and the world as we perceive it is influenced by our bodily movements, just as we are influenced by how the world presents itself to us. We are aware of the world through our bodies, and we are aware of our bodies through the world, in a constant state of interplay where the world ‘is at the heart of our flesh’ (Merleau-Ponty, 1968, p.136). Applying Merleau-Ponty, campus encapsulates participants' indivisible relationship between themselves and their environment and situates campus as an aspect of ‘being-in-the world’. This enmeshing of the material and the subjective means that phenomenology can help access not only, ‘what’ participants encounter (embodied, subjective materiality), but also ‘how’ they encounter it (the process of encounter). I will use phenomenology to think about how participants perceive their experiences, and the relationship between their experiences and the objects correlating to them in the world around them.

International students' experience of campus is mediated through their culture and history. They may hold different values, ethics and norms which influence their perception, and interpretation of Port Campus. Bodies are culturally and socially located and carry particular cultural meanings which, Ahmed (2019) argues, means
that the body is ‘entangled’ with the social, with how we perceive and feel ourselves perceived by others and this thesis will be alert to the socio-political aspects of participants' embodiment.

**The Body Schema**

Merleau-Ponty (2012) describes our process of perceiving the world as happening through the body schema, which denotes how our processes of embodied perception determine how we navigate the world. The body schema depicts our understanding of the world as a bodily one and explains how bodies implicitly respond and organize themselves in relation to their surroundings. The body schema incorporates physical, mechanical, biochemical, and neurological processes which feed into and evoke perception, sensory experience and movement (Gallagher, 2005), and is a form of experience and meaning making that is pre-reflective or prior to consciousness. The body schema develops according to our life experiences and relationships with others and is a useful concept to understand how bodies are connected to the spatial environment (Merleau-Ponty, 2012).

The body’s capacity for movement or directedness in its environment occurs through a process of motor intentionality (Merleau-Ponty, 2012). Motor intentionality describes how our skills, senses, experiences and habits integrate to direct our embodied perception towards aspects of our environment. Our body schema enables this mobile directedness towards the world, allowing our bodies to anticipate and orientate ourselves to situations, before we have consciously thought, planned or formed opinions about them. Motor intentionality as part of the body schema, drives our reactions to others and to objects in the world. As a latent process, the body schema functions dynamically, always in the perceptual background, determining our
responses and activities, enabling us to move freely in the world without needing to focus upon what our bodies are doing in the moment (Gallagher, 2005). For example, Merleau-Ponty (2012) describes that when leaning on his desk he is only aware of the pressure of his hands touching the desk. He is aware neither of the rest of his body in relation to the room space, nor of it in relation to objects in his room. His body schema affords him perceptual security about his body, enabling him to focus only on the position of his hands. The body schema therefore becomes a form of orientation (Ahmed, 2006, 2007), bringing about, ‘motor-cognitive anticipations’ of our future experience (Hale, 2019, p. 296) which allow us to project ourselves into the world, navigate situations with ease and acquire a sense of perceptual control.

Ahmed’s (2007, p. 152) definition of bodies that are permitted to ‘reach towards’ a world which is ‘available as a space for action’ is an example of how the body schema can enable some people to occupy and use the world. The body schema enables a body to ‘extend’ (Ahmed, 2007, p. 153) into space. The body schema can be seen as an implicit, pre-reflective, epistemological perspective which forms our knowledge and habitual understanding of our environment and situates consciousness as a multisensory, bodily process enabling action in the world,

   Consciousness is originarily not an ‘I think that’, but rather an 'I can' (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p. 139).

Whilst the body schema is usually in the background, sometimes we may be presented with situations that confound our expectations and we discover that our habitual ways of relating in the world do not fit the context. Ahmed (2007) describes this as an interruption to the body schema whereby the body is no longer permitted to be a 'body-at-home' in the world. This can disrupt, or interrupt, our being-in-the world,
causing us to become self-conscious, aware of a bodily disjunction and of the need to adapt to a different situation. Merleau-Ponty (2012) draws attention to the body schema’s potential plasticity and ability to change when brought to consciousness through new or unexpected situations. However, he also acknowledges that there may be tensions arising from a need to adapt differently and cites an example of phantom limb syndrome, where pain is still experienced in an amputated limb, suggesting the potential for people to persist with habits and routines even though they are discordant with the current circumstances.

**The body schema and our relationships to other bodies in the world.**

Our body schema is our point of perception of others. We use our bodies to copy others' actions and we, unselfconsciously, move our bodies in relation to others. Merleau-Ponty describes the body as having preestablished ways of perceiving (2012) that filter and manage our responses to others and function as a form of template that we use to project onto and comprehend the world. These perceptual templates, as seen in the example of Merleau-Ponty and the desk, enable a perceptual, background or taken-for-grantedness about aspects of the world. We relate to others primarily through our bodily responses which occur prior to conscious thought. Whilst these bodily responses may not necessarily filter into conscious awareness, they nevertheless reside in the body, pivot its movements and selectively determine the things that we see as significant (Lewis, 2018).

Merleau-Ponty (2012) argues that we understand another person through connecting our experiences with theirs, in a unity or connection akin to the slotting together of
gears, that we understand another’s feelings not through reference to abstract knowledge of, for example, anger, but through thinking about and making a connection with our own experience of anger. We appreciate others experiences through our own connection to our own similar experiences (Romdenh-Romluc, 2011).

Merleau-Ponty’s theorisation of the body schema has been critiqued (Fanon, 1967; Lewis, 2018; Ahmed, 2007; Weate, 2001) because it rests on a notion of embodied perceptual similarity, which does not take into account social structures which differentiate the degree which certain sorts of body are received in in particular places. A state of 'ease' in a world in which one’s body is received without question is not a universal experience. For example, Fanon (1967) discusses how the sense of the body acting with unconscious ease is interrupted for black people. Even simple bodily actions may not 'just happen' in an unconscious way if one has a black body in a society which is orientated around whiteness and which inherits colonialism or the history of slavery. In such environments, a person’s scope for action may be much more limited and constrained than is the case for those who share whiteness. Fanon’s account shows that to be a strange body, a black body in a world where the structures of the world and scope for action within them is shaped by whiteness, can result in feelings of self-consciousness and unease. In such a world, where being human is often identified with being white, then not being white is, ‘to inhabit the negative’ and to be perceived in terms of deficit (Ahmed, 2007, p. 161). Ahmed (2007) argues that when Merleau-Ponty theorizes the body as being able to extend itself with ease (with the acquisition of unconscious motor skills and habits of behaviour and understanding) that this is not so much a question of competence but
of privilege. A person is able to move with ease in a world which adapts to extend their body and enables it to move with ease. Bodies which are ‘strange’, which do not share in the characteristics which order their environment, such as whiteness in Ahmed’s discussion, may find that they are not at ease, that they are resisted, or negated, are ‘not’. Whiteness therefore confers a greater capacity for the body, enhancing its sense of, ‘I can’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p. 139) and correspondingly it curtails minority ethnic group bodies and enlarges their perceptual sense of, ‘I can not’ (Staudigl, 2012, p. 32).

Like Ahmed (2007), Lewis (2018) extends Merleau-Ponty’s conception of the body schema, suggesting that it does not take account of race or of ‘an ontology of difference’ (Lewis, 2018, p. 125) because Merleau-Ponty’s ideas about intersubjectivity rest on a conception of our embodied similarity with others. Lewis disputes Merleau-Ponty’s (2012) idea that a body is a ‘miraculous extension’ of another’s body, that when occupying the world together, form ‘a single whole’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p. 370) and suggests that this does not take account of the way ontological differences such as race, class, gender, shape bodily experiences. He suggests that Merleau-Ponty’s conception of relationships with others seems to imply an existential or ontological equality that does not reflect the diversity and complexity of social relations between diverse others, and that Merleau-Ponty fails to account for a racialized body schema as described by Fanon (1967) and Ahmed (2006). Lewis (2008), Ahmed (2006, 2007) and Fanon (1967) highlight the implicit failure of Merleau-Ponty’s notion of the body schema to recognise the differential power accorded to some bodies more than others and its failure to acknowledge the effects of historic, sedimented oppression on the formation and maintenance of
bodily habits and bodily engagement with others. Lewis (2018) draws on Fanon to suggest that the bodily movements of white bodies affect the body schema of black bodies, influencing how bodies move, their bodily pre-reflective, implicit knowledge, derived from history and culture and bodily expectations of how the world is constituted. Lewis (2018) and Ahmed (2007) suggest that race is part of our embodied relation to others and being embodied, enacts or directs social relationships in a way that is tacit and often prior to thought.

Ahmed (2007) uses Merleau-Ponty creatively to theorize race relations in contemporary UK society. She argues that white bodies, through embodied history, culture and habit, influence and determine how bodies of colour can take up space. She uses Merleau-Ponty’s idea of consciousness as embodied, of projecting itself into the world and therefore being-in-the world, so becoming part of space. She discusses that places can ‘orientate’ the relationships that happen within them, making some bodies feel more at home than others (Ahmed, 2007, p. 153). In this account, ideas of habit as well a physical capacity for action are in play. Habits can show the ease of Merleau-Ponty’s engagement in the world. His actions occur with bodily ease, his body schema showing a perceptual security that gives rise to a habitual way of being. In this sense, the body behind the hands that touch the desk propels and is ‘behind’ (Ahmed, 2007, p.156) the action of the hands.

The notion of the habitual lying behind action can be extended to whiteness, in that whiteness can be a habit, directing behaviour and determining the self and other’s scope for action (Ahmed, 2007). White bodies in this society do not encounter obstacles in being white, there is a sense of whiteness going ‘unnoticed’, becoming what bodies cohere around (Ahmed, 2007). This means that spaces can be shaped
by the cohering of white bodies, in which bodies that are not white are ‘strange’, shown up in relief against a ‘sea of whiteness’ (Ahmed, 2007, p. 159). These ideas about white bodies cohering together in a world in which having white skin ensures a level of ease are described in DiAngelo’s (2011) work and her notion of ‘white fragility’. She observes that many white people tend to work and socialise with predominantly white people, which insulates them from encountering minority ethnic people and from thinking about issues connected with race. This creates less opportunity for meaningful reflection and engagement with minority ethnic people about race and about different worldviews, and less opportunity for challenging the bodily ease conferred through whiteness. DiAngelo (2011) notes that when white people encounter other people’s experiences of racism, they tend to react with discomfort and distress which can shut down the conversation, re-centre the focus and attention on to white people’s feelings and de-emphasise the needs and experiences of minority ethnic others. Applebaum (2017, p. 864) interprets white fragility as, ‘a form of racial violence and an active performance of invulnerability’ which enables white people to avoid thinking about uncomfortable aspects of their socialisation and its construction of their white identity and confirms, ‘students of color as culprits who are the “cause of tension”’ (Applebaum, 2017, p. 865). These processes perpetuate the separation of white bodies from possible encounters with the bodies of those who are not white. This lack of encounter enables white people to avoid thinking about the embodied experience of black people and so avoid experiencing the discomfort of being challenged. International doctoral students have entered a geographical space where they are in a minority, a space that has been constructed, through the embodiment of others over time, to form a historicised, cultural entity designed by, and for, the dwelling of the British majority. The extent to
which participants may feel a sense of ease (or unease) in their bodily operations, perceptions and experiences could be an important aspect of campus. Paying attention to how this may be happening for participants will be part of my phenomenological approach.

**Political implications of difference: Merleau-Ponty and Arendt on intersubjectivity, oppression and living together with different others**

International doctoral students engage with others in the public world of Port University and Port City. Part of their experience of campus involves working and living alongside others and therefore questions of the intersubjective relationship between students and others are integral to understanding their experience of campus. Merleau-Ponty (2012) suggests that intersubjectivity relies on two factors, firstly that we see others as subjects, as people who think and feel and act and inhabit the world, and secondly that we perceive others as being aware of us as subjects (as people who think and feel and inhabit the world). In other words, there needs to be a reciprocity of co-perception that implies a sense of shared world where others appear to us, and we appear to others.

Hannah Arendt ‘life’s work (1994, 1958, 1963, 1973) was focused on questions of how people live together or share the world and is useful in thinking about how power and agency may be experienced by international doctoral students in their relations with others on campus and in the city. Building on Merleau-Ponty’s idea of how we connect, pre-reflectively, in the moment as being about a mutuality of perception, Arendt (1958) thinks about how we can arrange ourselves to build a society with multiple and different others. She argues that sharing a world requires an ability to be
reflective, because thinking reflectively puts a person into a plural situation, one that
connects them with others. By being able to think about other people’s standpoints
and being able to question oneself, the thinker is engaged in consideration of
something beyond themselves. When we can think of others' points of view, we
begin to become social beings, aware of ourselves and others and part of a wider
world, we move from being 'I' to being 'we' (Butler, 2011). Arendt (1973) also
considers extensively what happens when this mutuality of perception does not take
place, when individual or groups of people are not perceived as subjects who inhabit
the world, whose place in the world is resisted or contested. She traces the
development of Anti-Semitism through European society and culture (Arendt, 1973).
She is not so much constructing a historical narrative of the events involved,
describing rather the evolution of the Anti-Semitic meanings that were made of the
Jewish populations of European cultures, and what social and political uses these
meanings had in supporting and maintaining social structures of power. The sorts of
meaning making by majority populations about Jewish people diminished the
possibility of intersubjectivity, instead they 'othered' the Jewish population, casting
Jews as different to the majority, and in some strands of thought as hostile, deceptive
and over-powerful, and ultimately as less than human. She discusses that these
processes shaped the responses that were available to the Jewish populations in
developing identities and ways to function in these societies. Her study suggests that
there are processes by which meaning is made of a minority group by the majority,
which restricts the space the minority group has to construct its identity and to
function in the social environment, that there are ways minority individuals or groups
become liable to attack if they are perceived not to be in the 'right' spaces, and that
there are processes of questioning their presence and hostility towards them, which
escalate through misrepresentation and ‘othering’, dehumanising and verbal, social and physical attack.

For Arendt living together, in contrast, means recognising and acknowledging people with all their differences. Intrinsic to this is accepting the potential for all people to have agency in the continuing, co-creation of the world. She was committed to finding ways to take account of the variety of perspectives that occur with human diversity and was concerned to enable the participation of people in civic affairs, recognising that groups who were isolated from others could become disempowered and lack agency over their lives.

Action, as distinguished from fabrication, is never possible in isolation; to be isolated is to be deprived of the capacity to act (Arendt, 1958, p. 188).

In human affairs, our actions are meaningful only in relation to others and Arendt (1958) suggests that for an action truly to be considered as such, it has to impact someone else: without the response of another, the action remains an uncompleted beginning, and the person who initiates it is not taken account of by the world. Arendt (1958) sees agency as founded upon appearing to others and upon having the opportunity to have dialogic relations with others. How participants experience themselves as ‘appearing’ to others offers a way of thinking about how campus supports them to have agency over their affairs. This is particularly relevant in helping to conceptualise the importance of meaningful engagement between the different populations within a university setting, recognising each member as an active, co-creator of the university environment. Arendt (1958), echoing Merleau-Ponty (2012), asserts that public, social, and institutional spaces have the potential to be spaces we
can share because they represent places where we can appear to each other, perceive each other in the same way as we perceive ourselves, have agency, and be reflective. An academic institution would seem to embody this potential.

A Discussion of Space and Place

This section looks at conceptualisations of space and place and resists adopting a polarised view of place as a fixed, limited perceptual horizon bounded by itself and a similarly polarised view of space as a neutral container of place. Instead, drawing on Massey (1994, 2005) and Shields (2007), I conceptualise place and space as relational and suggest a notion of place as subject to, and influenced by, wider socio-political spatial, geopolitical flows. I also suggest that places have the capacity to yield differentiated place-based experiences and draw on Shields' notion of place mythology to connect notions of place to the embodied actions of those within them. Then, I look at other spatial conceptions of the student experience including third spaces.

Space

A notion of space seems to allow for conceptualisations of wider, worldly influences such as migration or economic progress which influence local lives (Massey, 1994). It offers a view from above that connects globalized power with local experience. Many definitions of space involve or imply a relationship to place and suggest that both are inseparable. Bondi writes that space has come to be seen as ‘neutral, objective, pre-existing and timeless’ (2005, p.139) noting that it is often situated alongside other qualities such as time and positioned in opposition to subjectivity. She observes that the notion of space is often used as means of avoiding individualising issues, as seeing them as connected to particular people or places, and that referring to space
is a strategy to avoid place-based, essentialist notions of wider socio-political issues. Like place, space can be seen as co-constructed by the people who occupy it, who can transform it into a hostile space or a site of inequality (Kirby, 1996). Harrison and Dourish (1996), regard space as a structure that locates and directs people and proceedings and contains commonly understood attributes such as up and down, front and back, near and far. Beyond this they regard aspects such as cultural understanding and human relationships as belonging to and enacted in place. This conceptualises space as a location (for the activities of place) and place as a ‘subset’ of space (Low, cited in Furia, 2020, p. 540).

Lefebvre (1991) theorises space as ‘a social dynamic, an incessant movement’ (Vermeulen, 2015, para. 8) formed from the interaction of three perspectives that are in communication, and possibly tension, with each other. These perspectives are ‘conceived space’, consisting of the practice of social and political power, understood and experienced through knowledge and ideology; ‘lived space’, or the subjective meanings and attachments we make of space, and ‘perceived space’ or our common-sense understanding of our daily experiences of space. Interactions happen dynamically between top down (conceived space), bottom up (perceived space) and the negotiations in between (lived space). Lefebvre’s conception of space is an inherently mobile, changeable one where three perspectives engage with and across each other to form space. This dynamic formulation of space requires a notion of place as it situates the three spatial negotiations as needing to occur within place in order to make the interactions ‘tangible’ (Vermeulen, 2015, para 9). Lefebvre’s theory posits relationships between external power (conceived space), personal desire (lived space) and the reality of how people live in space.
(perceived space). The complex negotiations and tensions between the three dimensions impact upon how people live in place. Lefebvre (1991) sees place as emerging from spatial tensions and offers me a way of examining the physical campus and the relationships people forge with the physical space of campus. These notions of space require place and imply a set of interrelationships between space and place, I endorse Lefebvre’s (1991) relations between different sets of space seeing them as requiring operationalising within place and as manifesting differently in different places. Below I set out the importance of place as embedded within wider social and political relationships.

**Place**

Place has been defined in varying ways as: ‘a portion of geographic space’ (Bondi, 2005, p. 139); a container of material aspects, social life and meaning-making (Agnew 2011; Cresswell, 2008; Dovey, 2010); a site of multiple physical, social and economic intersecting processes (Massey, 1992); a discursive production (Furia, 2020) and phenomenologically, as a site where place-specific, qualitative experience and relationships happen (Seamon, 1979). Dovey (2010) characterises place as an ‘intensity’ of connection between the social and place, whilst others have suggested that place is pivotal to identity formation (Nairn and Kraftl, 2015; Casey, 1993, 1997). Contemporary conceptions of place encompass their localised nature as a centre of particular meaning whilst also leaving conceptual room for place as subject to aspects outside of its geographical boundary, such as wider social, political, economic and technological movements or flows (Massey, 1992; Dovey, 2010).

Casey (1993) suggests that without place we cannot exist, and that a conception of the world has to begin with place rather than space. He sees place is distinct and as
a site of particular relationships (Casey, 1993). In contrast to Harrison and Dourish (1997), Casey’s ideas imply a notion of space as subsumed by place, as not being able to exist without place. Most definitions of place tend to suggest that it has distinct, rather than universal qualities, and suggest that place offers particularity in terms of the types of relationships, attachments and meaning making it facilitates, suggesting that place has a distinctive material, social and meaningful impact on the experiences of those living within it (Cresswell, 2015). A phenomenological understanding of place regards mind, body and the world as intertwined, presupposing that people are entwined with the world and as such are ‘emplaced’ within it (Seamon 2018). Phenomenology ties bodies to places and places to the wider world (space) in an indivisible set of entwined relationships which seem akin to aspects of Massey’s approach (1994). Whilst not wishing to dispute the ‘placeness’ of experience, I suggest that Casey’s view of place as the starting point may run the risk of deprioritizing the importance of aspects wider-than-place, such as migratory flows and the impact of technology in reproducing aspects of place in multiple sites, such as during the covid-19 pandemic when students were forced to recreate their university from home. Drawing on Massey (1994), I see space and place as relational and intertwined with the wider socio-political context, regarding this as reflecting a broadly phenomenological position (Merleau-Ponty, 2012) that refutes binaries and separations between people and aspects of the world.

**Beyond binaries: Massey’s (1994) conceptualisation of place.**

Massey (1994, p. 23) describes place as, ‘social relations stretched over space’ constituted by national and international influences which are constantly changing. She describes these changes as ‘flows’ to and from the wider world which means
that place can reach beyond itself. Massey (1994, p. 156) defined these multiple influences as ‘power geometries’ which position people differently: a place may be subject to differential flows of migration and economic investment from another place but will still be in relationship to, and influenced by, a wider spatial context. This enables place to be both distinct and general. The relational stance means that both place and space influence each other, that place is ‘contingent and tied into a broader context’ (Hubbard, Kitchin, Bartley, Fuller 2005, p. 17) and that both contain an element of porosity and fluidity. In a poetic description of this co-constitution of space and place, Massey (2005, p. 130) sees space as, ‘a simultaneity of stories-so-far’ and places as, ‘collections of those stories' arising from the wider ‘power-geometries of space’.

This research explores international doctoral students’ experience of the Port University campus. The wider context is important as the campus is embedded in the centre of Port City. Massey (2005, p. 181) refers to ‘a relational politics of place’, implying that space and place are not fixed containers but can be seen in terms of their ‘openness and closure’ and ‘connectivity' between commodities, people and concepts (Massey, 2005, p. 181). Massey’s idea of place contains notions of flow and permeability, which complement an idea of campus and city as porous. Port University campus has an open design, admitting people to enter freely. Haenni’s (2020) reflections upon the ‘porous city’ helps to elucidate aspects of the relationship between Port City and the university campus. The concept of a porous city derives from a Benjamin and Lacis (1978) essay about Naples, which described porosity as a state of impermanence that could connect the built environment with the social and enable opportunity (through movement in and out). Porosity helps us to understand
how universities relate to their particular urban locations (Brennan and Cochrane, 2019) and my research regards them as intertwined. Both campus and city will influence participants and my research will incorporate aspects of the city as well as campus.

**Spatialisation**

Shields’ (2007) concept of spatialisation extends Massey’s (2005) description of places as collections of stories by introducing an aligned concept of places as constructed by and through public discourses, which become sedimented in people’s consciousness as associated with the place. He refers to these discourses as ‘place myths’ which both produce and sustain notions of place. These place myths are a way of distinguishing places from each other, and they not only construct the present but frame the future. He sees spatialisation as a process whereby discourse, or place myths, can result in irrational meaning acquisition and labelling of places and suggests that once place myths are formed, they can be difficult to dislodge. His concept of spatialisation describes how a person’s habitual orientation towards place is influenced by place myths which can be implicitly transmitted and expressed through the body and its movements.

Describing place as a ‘memory bank for societies’ Shields (2007, p.3) suggests that these memories and meanings are inscribed in the body and influence what bodies can do in the place. This notion suggests that place is part of the body schema (Merleau-Ponty, 2012), expressed through routine embodied patterns of movement in place. The somatic dimension refers to how bodies act when they are ‘in place’ and whether they comply with embodied ‘place norms’. Shields implies that conformity to these perceived, bodily inscribed norms, evokes bodily ease. Shields, (2007) like
Ahmed, offers an understanding of embodiment as the means by which history and place myths are passed down, and how bodily rhythms shape the actions of bodies in place.

**The third space**

The application of spatial terminology to higher educational settings and processes has yielded useful concepts for illuminating the doctoral student experience. Elliot et al. (2016) integrate a number of different spatial conceptions of the student educational experience and conceptualise international doctoral students' academic acculturation as, initially the experience of ‘two co-existing ecological systems’ (p. 737), those of home and away. They suggest that the tension between old and new ecological systems can evoke a reflective process of ‘decontextualisation’ (p. 737), which, if resolved successfully, inspires growth and development in students. Other spatial conceptions include spaces outside of formal academic ones. They suggest that learning and skills development can happen informally, in other spaces such as through leisure activities, or through the ‘hidden curriculum’ which teaches ‘uncodified’ knowledge (p.728) such as implicit values, attitudes and beliefs that are absorbed inadvertently by students. Finally they discuss the notion of the ‘third space’ (p. 740) where learning is acquired inadvertently in informal spaces, through friendships, social activities and the pursuit of personal interests. Elliot et. al (2016) recommend that universities harness the power of the third space and support students to access the social benefits of third space activities and highlight the potential of activities involving local people as well as those with other students. The importance of these ideas is that when applied to international doctoral students' experiences, they reveal the potential ‘hidden treasure’ of informal, social
experiences outside of formal academic spaces to foster students' learning and support their negotiation between prior and present ecological systems. It is possible that campus may be a form of ‘third space’ offering international doctoral students a particular form of experiential learning and relationship potential.

**Mobility – travelling in the ‘here’ and ‘there’.**

What chiefly characterises the international student experience from that of home students is a notion of travel beyond national boundaries, of transnational mobility, of going from one country to another. This implies a point of departure and a point of arrival, a ‘here’ and a ‘there’ and contains a temporal aspect of being ‘here’ when once we were ‘there’. This conceptualisation of doctoral student mobility as a process of ‘moving back and forth between two restricted states in a dichotomous manner,’ (Bilecen, 2013, p. 669) has been challenged by researchers who suggest rather that the international student journey encompasses multiple processes with the potential to confuse and challenge binaries of here-and-there.

Dovey (1985, p. 42) suggests that we bring our prior experience to places and that personal meanings of place are saturated with our previous meaning-making of the world. She suggests that the material environment evokes memories which become ‘concretised’ and associated with place. Extending Dovey (1985), this suggests that international students may carry accrued, specific, place-based meanings or memories from one place to another with the potential to create a complex mix of resonant or discordant cultural meanings. However, the idea of memories being ‘concretised’ though the physical environment implies a sense of causality that speaks of sedimentation, of a fixed association of place and meaning, implying a discreet, bounded and observable procedure. This challenges a phenomenological
stance which sees meaning as fluid and people and place as intertwined. Heidegger (1962) suggests that as we take the aspects of world into us, we are simultaneously indivisibly, taken in by the world. This phenomenological conception dissolves dichotomies between an inner ‘here’ and an outer ‘there’, but also suggests that in mobility we transport into new places aspects of former places, that we are the world(s) in all their multiplicities. We embody the world with us, as part of us and when we come to a new place, we inevitably bring other spaces and places with us. We make the world and the world makes us or as Seamon and Mugerauer (1985, p. 5) suggest, ‘person houses world and world houses person’. Old places form new places, becoming subsumed within a new, historicised, localised perception in an embodied spatial dialectical process, whereby ‘there’ and ‘here’ are continuously meeting through the body (space), and the ‘here-and-now’ inevitably contains the ‘there-and-then’ (space and time). Not only does this extend notions of place but sees mobility as an elastic back-and-forth with the potential to subsume aspects of ‘there’ into ‘here’.

Madison (2009, p. 25), speaking of the experience of people who chose to leave home, brings what he calls a ‘process’ perspective to describing the migratory experience, seeing the process as an ‘implicit flux’, hard to articulate, non-sequential and developed through everyday living. Madison’s (2009) conceptualisation evokes the complexity and ongoing negotiations and meaning making involved in living in an unfamiliar place. This chimes with other researchers of international student mobility such as Bilecen (2013, p. 670) who conceptualises it in terms of an ‘oscillation’ at the crux of multiple contexts, including ‘economic, political, social, personal and

My research, influenced by Massey (2005), sees campus as constituted by journeys and connections with other places, as porous and as containing collections of stories. I see international doctoral students’ mobility as a trajectory of connection, offering a multiplicity of new social relations, created through travel, and a linking of places.

Students come with personal histories and identities to a permeable, changing place, an unfixed ‘here’, a place that they have a part in defining through their interactions with others.

Madison’s (2010) studies of people who choose to leave their home country and become a foreigner found that notions of ‘home’ often resided and were discovered within the experience of being ‘not-at-home’. This suggests that for international doctoral students, feeling ‘at home’ in Port City may entail a set of myriad, ongoing processes, derived, and arising out of, being away from their home country. Being in a different place may evoke revised notions of home, as the different context may shed light on aspects of home that were previously taken for granted. This has the potential to complicate and extend ideas about distance and place and opens up the possibility that Port University campus could be both home and away and neither home nor away. It also confuses the question about when leaving ends and arrival begins, seeing both leaving and arriving as happening in multidirectional, indivisible flows.

International students come to Port University to study. Their travel condenses the cognitive distance between ‘here’ and ‘there’ because it brings ‘there’, ‘here’ and in
doing so potentially brings distant and unseen aspects to Port City in the form of, for example, customs, language and new knowledge. This has the potential to widen and challenge the ‘cognitive mappings’ (Shields, 1992, p. 183) of home students, staff and residents of Port City and rewrite the place myths (Shields, 2007) or stories (Massey, 2005) created about Port City. The students encapsulate not only arrival, but also the possibility of departure: their temporary presence contains the potential of a future absence. They may arrive with a differently located past (to their home student counterparts) which is brought into a newly sited present, which encapsulates a future that contains the potential of absence. The international student carries within them different temporal locations to locals (past, present and future), seen through a series of spatial discontinuities (here, there and potentially not-here).

Wilkinson and Badwan (2021) critique literature about student mobility for concentrating on mobilities associated with migration and leaving home and call for greater attention to be paid to the 'microbodily mobilities' (p.373) associated with students' everyday movements in place. Whilst their study focused neither on international students nor exclusively on doctoral students (three out of nine participants were doctoral students), their research highlighted the significance of students' ordinary, place-based walking practices in shaping experience and identity. My research with international doctoral students seeks to look at their banal, daily movements in campus and I suggest that micro mobilities have the potential to encapsulate and illustrate the intersection of multiple mobilities, histories and stories. Methodologically, Wilkinson and Badwan (2021) selected semi-structured interviews for their potential to permit confidential discussion of sensitive aspects and enable rich, in-depth, complex and varied narratives. However, as they indicate, this type of
'sedentary' (p. 378) method does not capture the in-the-moment, immersive visceral or sensual aspects of everyday mobility and they recommend a walking methodology to shed light on these aspects. A walking interview would also address a research gap as, to my knowledge, there are no studies using walking interviews that focus exclusively on international doctoral students' experience of campus.

**The doctoral experience: academic identity mobility**

Academic issues are not easily separated from personal and social ones (McAlpine, 2012) and doctoral study has been associated with isolation (Wallace, 2022; Bettinson and Haven Tang, 2021; Dortch, 2016; Mantai, 2015), ‘suffering' (Skakni, 2008, p. 933) and anxiety and self-doubt (McPherson, Punch, & Graham, 2017; Jackman et al., 2022). The potential for culture shock and other responses to transition underline how moving country to study is ‘multi-sensory and embodied' and felt ‘in an emotional and affective sense' (Adey 2010, p. 162; Hernandez, 2021).

International doctoral students negotiate mobilities associated with going ‘from’ one academic status (undergraduate or masters student) ‘towards’ another (doctoral study). Becoming a doctoral student requires complex identity negotiations that encompass and go beyond the purely academic (Mantai, 2017; Hall and Burns, 2009) and has been conceptualised as an investment in a process of personal and professional self-transformation (Lipura and Collins, 2020; Hazel et al., 2020) entailing 'multi linear and interactive' combinations of personal changes and experiences of day-to-day living both within and outside of the academic context (Tobbell et al., 2010, p.262).
Doctoral study requires independent learning and it has been suggested that international doctoral students may not find it as easy to access peer and academic cultures as home doctoral students (Deem and Brehony, 2000) and may benefit from institutional support (Borg et al., 2009) such as relational academic mentoring (Lee et al., 2022) and the provision of formal and informal academic and peer networks (Weng, 2020; Douglas, 2020; Mittelmeier et al., 2018). These networks and mentoring relationships could buffer the effects of intellectual strain and protect against burnout and could be especially valuable to doctoral students from the humanities and social sciences, as these subjects may not offer the same access to networks of staff and students as those in natural sciences or technology, where research may be more team-based (Delamont et al. 1997; Deem and Brehony 2000; Chiang, 2003).

Evans and Stevenson (2009), reviewing research into the experiences of international doctoral nursing students, found that students struggled to adjust to the difference in pedagogy and with having to work more independently. Doctoral study can present a form of ‘academic culture shock’ (Bai and Wang, 2022) engendering similar emotional responses to those experienced through other cross-cultural transitions (Searle and Ward, 1990; Brown and Holloway, 2008). Whilst it is tempting to associate the term culture shock with unpleasant feelings, Zapf (1991) emphasises that it should be understood as a temporary aspect of a wider trajectory of adaptation, that if negotiated successfully, has the potential to enhance the international student experience as they deploy agency to thrive in the face of academic and linguistic challenges (Bai and Wang, 2022; Nguyen and Robertson,
This accords with this research which seeks to depict the experiences of international doctoral students as mobile, complex and fluid.

Loneliness among international doctoral students has been cited as a serious issue (Bettinson and Haven-Tang, 2021; Janta et al., 2014; Sawir et al., 2008) and as a critical factor in the high attrition rate (Ali and Kohun, 2006). International doctoral students are especially vulnerable to feelings of isolation on multiple levels as well as academic, including social and emotional loneliness (White et al., 2023; Bettinson and Haven-Tang, 2021; Cantor, 2020; Erichsen & Bolliger, 2011) due to the particular and multiple changes they negotiate through moving away from their country, and leaving behind familiar social support networks and cultural references.

The body in motion

Academic and personal issues are hard to separate (McAlpine, 2012; Cotterall, 2013; Bentley, 2018). Doctoral students' experiences are bodily ones, as their bodies are the means by which they perceive, express and enact the world (Hernandez, 2021). The world provides a space or context for experience which is perceived within bodies (Hernandez, 2021; Hopwood and Paulson, 2012). Embodied experience is a particular source of knowledge, 'dwelling in the body and enacted through the body', (Craig, et al., 2018, p 329) and as part of our relationship to the world, is intrinsic to our experience of learning and identity formation. Lelwica (2009, p. 124) identifies a pervasive, ‘disembodied approach to learning’ in the literature which sites it as an intellectual activity occurring ‘from the neck up’. She refers to the linguistic embeddedness of a mind-body dualistic approach, observing that there is still no singular word available to describe an integrated process of mind-body unification. Shapiro and Stolz (2018, p. 121) reviewing multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary...
research, refer to the emergent field of ‘embodied cognition’ which suggests that comprehension is a product of mind-body-environment interaction and consists of a ‘constant process of backwards-and-forwards' between all three, ‘in a circular feedback loop’. They cite neuroscientific research showing that the brain understands the world by imagining the body performing actions and that mind and reasoning arise from a complex interplay of minds, bodies and of bodily experiences in the world. The research suggests that the body is more than a house for a brain, its feelings and interactions with its environment contribute to perception and aligns with Merleau-Ponty’s (2012) theorisation of the body schema. Personal, emotional and bodily factors are interconnected with academic learning and academic production, because our particular body shapes how we understand the world and the sense we make of it (Hernandez, 2021; Waheed, 2021; Craig et al., 2018). This interconnectedness is not a static process as it involves transition and movement.

Haraway (1998, p. 589), echoing Merleau-Ponty, argues that knowledge and research is situated, and is inevitably,

the view from a body, always a complex, contradictory, structuring, and structured body, versus the view from above, from nowhere, from simplicity.

Hopwood and Paulson (2012, p. 677) also insist on the importance of taking account of the embodied nature of researchers and research practices, refuting a view of the body as a ‘discursive production' arising from and shaped by the social context and vocabularies used to describe it. They challenge the ‘absent presence' (p. 669) of bodies in doctoral student literature, which they see as privileging the cognitive and verbal over the somatic and material. They note that bodies have a tendency to ‘creep in' (p. 670) to research through race and gendered aspects. Recognising the
entwined nature of body and mind, body and space and bodies with other bodies, Hopwood and Paulson (2012) assert the importance of the body-world relation upon doctoral study and stress the bodily impress of ‘material, institutional and personal connections’ p. 674) which inevitably impact academic and emotional wellbeing. Considering bodily structures, rather than the nature of experiencing, Damasio (1994), a neuroscientist, asserts that thinking is a whole-body activity, not one that happens in the area of the brain. Payne (2020) drawing on the work of Damasio (1994) argues that the body consists of interconnecting systems, all of which link with and influence brain functioning, making it impossible to separate the body from mental functioning.

The intellectual, academic task of the doctoral student is inherently mobile and embodied not just in terms of the body-world interplay, but also in terms of a body-mind-world space of engagement. As well as moving through physical space, the students navigate intellectual space. Doctoral research requires the student to extend a ‘body’ of knowledge outwards, to a place (intellectual or practical) that knowledge has not been before. This academic task is a bodily process, involving ‘taking in’ content, engaging internally with it, letting that content or data entwine itself cognitively within the body (brain) which is then able to transform it into something new. The doctoral body of the student then gives this new ‘thing’ out (via theses, publications, conferences etc.) and hence it becomes both part of the person and part of the world where it may travel, in different directions, through the interventions of other bodies. Thus, doctoral study is an internal and external bodily process requiring the ability to navigate intellectual, socio-cultural and emotional space. Bondi (2019) extends this idea, discussing the bodily presence in, and underpinning of,
cognitive processes. In a way that coincides with Damasio (1994)’s comment above, she describes ‘intelligence distributed throughout my body’ and ‘the bodily impress of sensory experience’ (Bondi, 2019, p. 97) and relates how she attunes to her senses and sensibilities to locate herself within whatever she is doing. This helps her to track what might be happening between herself and another person, and/or herself and a place. The processes of thinking and knowledge production for Bondi are intimately bound up with bodily experience, sensation and perception.

These themes of embodiment, movement, relationship, emotion and socio-cultural significance are relevant and reflected in the experience of international doctoral students, in a manner that does not presuppose a Cartesian dualism.

**Entering white spaces: the experiences of minority ethnic doctoral students**

Ahmed’s (2006, 2007) conceptual framework is highly applicable to the Port City and the Port University campus contexts, as both populations are locations where white people form the vast majority, and there is a lack of cultural diversity. Given that international doctoral students are most likely to be from minority ethnic groups, their experience will inevitably contain the aspect of moving into a white space as a minority. When a space is constructed by and around a particular type of body, the people who construct the spaces and operate within them have the capacity to perpetuate their ease of use for the majority group, with potential negative consequences for minority bodies. Waters (2020) suggests that international students studying in Western countries have been treated badly, with insufficient attention paid to their particular needs. She argues universities see international students' bodies in terms of their cash value, that their academic needs are not given sufficient attention,
and that their voices are not represented on student committees. Katsumoto et al. (2023) similarly argue that the neoliberal climate of US universities means that, 'International doctoral students are commodified and discarded' (p. 4)

and that too little attention is paid to the identity and academic aspects of their experience. The literature would seem to bear out these claims. International doctoral students struggle to access academic and social peer support networks, perceive themselves as more excluded from departmental activities than domestic students (Bettinson and Haven-Tang, 2021; Deem and Brehony, 2000; Laufer and Gorup, 2019) and do not feel as involved in either their departmental or institutional contexts (Bettinson and Haven-Tang, 2021; Le and Gardner, 2010). They experience loneliness (Janta et al., 2014; Sawir et al., 2008), a sense of invisibility in the host university (Pinto, 2021) and are, as a minority group, at risk of marginalisation (Mayazumi, 2007), perceiving a lack of interest from local peers and colleagues in their countries (Laufer and Gorup, 2018). An American study of 62 black STEM doctoral students found that 87% had experienced racialised marginalisation, where they experienced themselves as being treated as outsiders and socially excluded on account of their race (McGee et al., 2022). This was echoed in other American studies including, Wallace’s (2022) research with black, first-generation doctoral students, Davis and Livingstone’s (2016) with social work doctoral students, and Shavers and Moore’s (2014) with black female doctoral students. Truong et al. (2014), reviewing the literature on postgraduate US minority ethnic group doctoral students, found repeated evidence of racism which included underrepresentation in graduate programs, cultural mismatch between the worldviews of students of colour and those represented in the curricula, stereotypes of their intellectual inferiority, lack
of access to faculty mentors who share their ethnic backgrounds, and limited engagement from faculty mentors in meaningful and substantive intellectual activities (p. 226).

Hsiao-Ching (2021) used a poetic analysis of her own and five other international doctoral students experiences academic experiences in a US university. She identified ‘multi-layered discrimination’ (p. 646) based on perceptions of English language proficiency, their appearance and perceptions about their cultural backgrounds and suggests that unless this discrimination is truly acknowledged and challenged, the ‘hegemony produced by whiteness' will be permitted to flourish. Finally, she called for universities to understand, accept and explore the impact of these multi-layered forms of discrimination on the racialisation and self-consciousness of international students.

There is less research into black students' doctoral experiences in the UK HE context. The Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES, 2023) highlighted a 'clear gap' (p. 14) in satisfaction between white postgraduate students and 'all minority ethnic categories,' (p.14) with minority ethnic students indicating that they received less opportunities for professional, career and academic skills development than their white counterparts. This echoed Williams et al.’s (2019) Leading Routes study which found that UK minority ethnic group doctoral students were more disadvantaged in terms of representation, access to career development, and received less funding than the majority group of white doctoral students. Arday’s (2017) qualitative research with minority ethnic group doctoral students included international students, and identified feelings of marginalisation, isolation and exclusion, and a lack of mentorship and support for minority ethnic group doctoral
students. Mattock and Briscoe-Palmer (2016)’s research with politics PhD students found that those identifying as a minority ethnic group felt they lacked support from staff and supervisors, and that they had been disadvantaged due to their ethnicity. This suggests a critical role for universities to ensure that all staff, including professional services staff, working with international students are culturally competent to respond to student reports of racism. This was endorsed by a Student Minds report (Frampton, Smith and Smithies, 2022) into international students’ mental health, which recommended that all staff were aware of and sensitive to international students increased risk of ‘discrimination, racism and xenophobia’, of the impact of global events, and understood the complexity and intersectionality of aspects of international students' identities (Frampton, Smith and Smithies, 2022, p. 9). The evidence suggests that international doctoral students are a group that may be prone to experiencing exclusion, minoritisation, lack of support and discrimination. Enhancing the cultural competence of university staff to ensure that international students receive appropriate, helpful and supportive institutional responses could be a step towards enhancing their wellbeing and student experience.

**International students' relationships with home students**

An educational setting is a space where students are a captive audience, a space for more than just the acquisition of knowledge and skills. It is a formal space of reflection and learning and Biesta (2016) argues that part of this learning is about political existence, where we can learn to 'bear with' strangers (Arendt, 1994). This section will examine the research on international students' relationships with, and perceptions of, home students.
The presence of international students on campus and in the community potentially offers an opportunity for the formation of transnational friendships, increased cultural awareness and creates the conditions for the development of enlarged thinking in all students, gained from repeated and meaningful encounters with perspectives different to their own. Yet research suggests that this is simply not happening, with studies suggesting that international students are prone to marginalisation (Bettinson and Haven-Tang, 2021; Hanassab, 2006; Leask, 2009). Much of the research attributes this to international students' lack of language proficiency and cultural unfamiliarity with the host culture and implies that not mixing with home students is a choice on the part of international students. Koehne's (2006) research with undergraduate and post graduate international students talks about their 'effort and struggle of communication' (p.250) noting that international students' efforts to engage with home students depend not only on their endeavours, but on a willingness on the part of home students to engage. Without the participation of home students, international students' efforts remain unrequited. Bradley (2000) found that international students perceived UK home students as ignorant and not respectful of their cultural backgrounds, suggesting this may impact on their struggle to make friendships with home students.

A persistent theme of research into the international student experience is the low incidence of friendships and social bonds between home and international students. Brown (2009) attests to this in fourteen studies dated between 1977 and 2007. Later work (Herman and Meki Kombe 2019; McMahon, 2018; Pham and Tran, 2015), indicate the persistence and longevity of this theme, which appears to transcend particular host countries, level of study and particular institutions.
International students wish to form friendships with home students (King and Bailey, 2021; Yang, 2014; Harrison and Peacock, 2010; Tsouroufli 2015; Tsouroufli and Sundaram, 2011; Marginson, 2014) with Yang (2014) rationalising this in relation to the effort and investment they have made to facilitate overseas study. Yun and Moskal, (2019, p. 655) state this more resolutely, referring to international students' 'strong desire' to form bonds with home students. International students' wish for meaningful contact with home students does not appear to be met with an equivalent desire on the part of home students (Xing and Bolden, 2021; Brown, 2009; Brown and Holloway, 2008; Marginson et al., 2010) with Tsouroufli’s (2015) research with international doctoral students finding that,

nearly all felt disappointed, or upset, that despite their resilience and commitment to participate and integrate, there was little or no effort from British students (p. 9).

The consequent lack of contact with home students means that international students deploy agency in developing 'dynamic and productive' (Deuchar, 2022, p. 508) social connections with other international students. However, this can mean that their learning about the host culture tends to be mediated through the experience and understandings of fellow international students (Myles and Cheng, 2003) via the formation of international student 'bubbles' (McKenzie and Baldassar, 2017) despite living and studying in close quarters with home students. This evokes Arendt’s (1958, 1973) observations that minority groups tend to form communities, and hence a community identity, in the social and material spaces afforded to them by the majority group. By not socializing with international students, home students effectively
delineate the social space available for international students as one populated by fellow international students.

International students are sometimes reported in the media in negative ways, with writers deploying ‘simplistic stereotyping’ Haugh (2008, p. 207). Bettinson and Haven-Tang’s (2021) research with doctoral students identified ‘othering’ and a ‘discourse of deficit surrounding international students’ (p.17). Drawing on an analysis by Devos in 2003, Haugh (2008) identifies the paradoxical reporting of international students in Australia that manages to convey ‘contempt’ for their lack of English language proficiency, whilst underscoring their ‘valuable’ economic importance to Australian universities. Lipura and Collins (2020) evaluation of scholarship on international student mobilities echoed this tension, noting that research tended to position international students, ‘as simultaneously desired and problematic’, (p. 12). Outside of the mass media, the language used by scholarly researchers to describe the situation international students find themselves in, sometimes appears to attribute the lack of contact between international and home students to a deficit or inclination on the part of international students. The use of terms such as, ‘retreat from interactions with the host culture’ (Slagter and Pyper, 2019, p. 47), ‘willingness to leave the confines of the monoethnic group’ (Brown, 2009, p. 185) and ‘tendency’ not to ‘maximise’ learning opportunities through contact with different cultural others (McMahon, 2018, p. 36) can appear to construe the lack of contact as a matter of private, individual and free choice. Whilst these kinds of statements may describe the observable behaviour of international students, the language used contains an implicit notion of international students voluntarily choosing not to socialise with home students. I suggest that this language runs the
risk obscuring the complex, and unequal systems of power at play. Haugh (2008) regards this positioning of international students as predicated upon Eurocentric ideas of education, which Keohne (2006) suggests show, ‘the lingering power of colonial discourses in post-colonial countries’ (p. 242). A number of studies (Deuchar, 2022; Brazill, 2021; Pham and Tran, 2015; Koehne, 2006; Marginson 2014) resist this discursive positioning of international students as in deficit, suggesting that it rests upon conceptions of Western expertise as containing a ‘virtual monopoly of knowledge production’ (Keohne, 2006, p.242). Pham and Tran (2015) allude to this implicit eurocentrism, noting that amidst the citations about international students' English language deficiencies and lack of cultural references, domestic students ‘ability to speak another language and to interact with culturally diverse peers is not often called into question. (p. 207).

Marginson (2014, p. 19) stresses international students ‘conscious, ‘irreducible and ever-present’ agency and challenges discourses that appear to place them in deficit, suggesting a role for universities to foster international students' culture, perspectives and practices as worthy of time, thought and as ‘worthy of equal respect’ (Marginson, 2014, p. 19) as that of home students. Denson and Bowman (2013, p. 557) refer to a need for institutions to commit to 'structured and purposeful programmatic efforts' to support students to think about difference and about the cultures and lives of others. Their research associated this type of pedagogic intervention with ‘improved intergroup attitudes and civic engagement outcomes' (p.555). They stress that these pedagogic practices need to be meaningful, high quality, include learning about diverse groups and involve interracial interactions. There are some practical resources available for academics to support this type of approach (HEA, 2014,
Arkoudis et al., 2013) which contain suggestions for educators, designed to enhance generative, interaction between home and international students.

**Methodological reflections on contemporary empirical studies – implications and critique**

Reflecting a shift since the early 2000s from quantitative approaches to qualitative ones (Page and Chahboun, 2019), contemporary research into the international student experience indicates a preference for semi-structured interviews as a method (Nguyen and Robertson, 2022; Wilkinson and Badwan, 2021; Bettinson and Haven-Tang, 2021; Hernandez, 2021; Brazill, 2021; King and Bailey, 2021; Pinto, 2021; Wang and Byram, 2019; Pham and Tran, 2015) due to their ability to yield a range of intricate and nuanced accounts. As large-scale quantitative research tends to yield findings connected to structural aspects, qualitative methods, such as semi-structured interviews, enable detailed focus on the individual student experience (Page and Chahboun, 2019). However, despite the many benefits of semi structured interviews, they may risk facilitating the researcher experience above that of the international student participant, due to the language considerations and power dynamics inherent within this method.

Semi-structured interviews permit confidentiality and privacy for discussion of personal, sensitive and distressing topics (Wilkinson and Badwan, 2021; Bettinson and Haven-Tang, 2021) and enable the construction of stories centred around particular aspects (Hernandez, 2021). Semi-structured interviews evoke conversation between researcher and participant, potentially engendering relational mutuality or back and forth (King and Bailey, 2021). King and Bailey (2021) describe interviews as the 'most objective' (p. 281) method for accessing qualitative aspects of human
experience. Whilst the term 'objective' appears at odds with the spirit and principles of qualitative enquiry (Holloway and Galvin, 2017) they are keen to assert the interview's potential to 'grasp' (King and Bailey, 2021, p. 281) salient aspects of experience. Semi-structured interviews offer opportunity for deep understanding through exploring and revisiting of experience through dialogue that inspires meaning making about that experience (Van Manen, 2016).

Other advantages of semi-structured interviews are that they enable the researcher to ask 'predetermined questions' which create 'a sense of order' whilst enabling disruption to this order by permitting the researcher to spontaneously respond to issues arising in the moment (Nguyen and Robertson, 2022, p. 817). This acknowledgement of the researcher's power to influence the content and direction of interview conversations positions them as influential in shaping the knowledge generated (Brazill, 2021). Semi-structured interviews are interpersonal encounters, subject to 'emotive flows' (p.114) and 'relational intensities' (p. 115) between researcher and participant (Hernandez, 2021). Given that much research with international students is conducted by researchers who may not share the students' culture or language, interpretation of participants' content, body language and interpersonal dynamics may be subject to misunderstanding. Openness about researcher subjectivities such as personal history and motivations for doing the research may not only build relationship with participants (Wallace, 2022) and offer the opportunity for identifying different cultural interpretations but could also constitute an equalising thrust situating researcher and participant as humans sharing and co-constructing the world (Arendt, 1958, 1963, 1973, 1994).
Much research with international students who are non-native English speakers is conducted in English (Bettinson and Haven-Tang, 2021; Badwan and Wilkinson, 2021; Hernandez, 2021; Pham and Tran, 2015; King and Bailey, 2021; Nguyen and Robertson, 2022). The language used to conduct semi-structured interviews has a bearing on relations between the researcher and participant (Wang and Byram, 2019) but is little discussed in international student research. Bettinson and Haven-Tang’s (2021) research into the doctoral journey included 11 international students and did not state their home countries. Given that a significant theme of their research involved language as a ‘barrier’ (p.8) and highlighted international students’ concerns about their conversational proficiency in English, it seems possible that this is also a factor in the research process. Similarly, Pham and Tran’s (2015) research involving interviews with 105 international students in Australia found that international students perceived that proficiency in English conferred high levels of cultural and political power which could enable social advancement, access to employment and a means to assimilate into a foreign culture. Pham and Tran (2015) were sensitive to the symbolic, social and political dimensions of English language proficiency for international students, but they did not reflect upon how the disparity in cultural, occupational and social privilege (conferred through language proficiency) between participants and researchers could have impacted their research process. Consideration of these and of other researcher-participant aspects could open the path for nuanced consideration of the impact of researcher-participant dynamics on the research process. King and Bailey (2021) offer an example of this type of cultural consideration to understand how despite inviting over 40 international students to participate in their research, they received 6 responses and finally interviewed 4 participants. Using Face-Negotiation Theory (King and Bailey, 2021, p.281) they
suggested that students from cultures influenced by this might have found it difficult to criticise their university, teachers or fellow students for fear of losing face. This consideration identified how cultural aspects may mean that certain voices may be silenced and marginalised within the wider discourse. Brazill's research (2021) with three Chinese international doctoral students in the USA highlights the benefits of the researcher having a shared language, cultural identity and heritage with her Chinese participants. This shared heritage enabled her to offer her participants the choice of English or Chinese for their interviews with all choosing to speak in Chinese. As a cultural insider, she was able to align both her and her participants' culture with her methodology, selecting semi structured interviews because they facilitated a narrative approach that respected the 'Chinese culture’s penchant for storytelling' (p. 404). Brazill’s (2021) status as a Chinese academic meant that she understood differences between Chinese and American culture and respected Chinese culture's conversation style with its greater use of ambiguous language, 'indirect, implicit communication' and its unspoken rules (p.401). It is possible that non-Chinese researchers, without Brazill's cultural history, may not be sensitive to these implicit dimensions of language and may not therefore be able to interpret the meaning conveyed behind unspoken conversational rules. This opens up the possibility of unintentionally yet culturally insensitive research. Whilst not wishing to suggest that semi-structured interviews in English (for research with international students whose first language is not English) is without benefits and capacity to yield rich data, the lack of reflection in the literature concerning potential power dynamics and their impact is surprising and suggests a missed opportunity for a more nuanced examination of methodology and a wider exploration of methodological limitations within the literature on the international doctoral student experience.
Given the potential for language and cultural disparities between researchers and participants, it may be helpful to consider the benefits of other methods to supplement or complement semi-structured interviews as a means of exploring international students' experience. Both Brazill (2021) and Wallace (2022) deployed artifacts to support and stimulate conversation. Brazill (2021), invited her international doctoral student participants to bring in an object and Wallace (2022) asked his participants (black, first-generation doctoral students) to select pieces of music that represented who they were and their doctoral journey. Both music and artifacts gave agency to participants to reflect in advance and to construct their experience privately before the interview, potentially addressing some of an interview's more 'top down' aspects. Wallace (2022) and Brazill's (2021) methods reflected understanding of their participants' culture. Brazill (2021) respected Chinese storytelling traditions and Wallace (2022) respected music as 'black people's way of knowing' (p.527). Wallace (2022) conceived his method as a form of 'counterstorytelling' (p. 527) that could challenge dominant narratives as the music choice evoked embodied knowledge that may not have been accessed via more traditional, language-based research methods. Other forms of research involving artefacts include photo elicitation (McLaughlan, 2023; Stevenson, 2017) as photos offer access to non-verbal experience (Radley and Taylor, 2003) and can,

capture the ineffable, the hard-to-put-into-words… Images can be used to communicate more holistically, incorporating multiple layers, and evoking stories or questions (Weber, 2008, p. 44).

Taking a photograph requires a directed focus upon the subject of the image which means making a choice of subject and composing an image. Photographs can
externalise a connection between a participant and the subject of the image that may until then, have been lived pre-reflectively rather than visually articulated (Radley and Taylor, 2003). Photos yield artefacts that can be explored in subsequent interviews and can function as an aide memoir, discussion prompt and means of communication about hard to articulate aspects (Sandhu et al., 2013). The participatory element of photo elicitation followed by interviews, may give participants power to influence how their experiences are interpreted by others, as participants can take the lead in articulating the meaning of their images (Sandhu et al., 2013).

Semi-structured interviews offer valuable opportunities for reflection on experience (Schon, 2019) but may not capture the sensory and bodily aspects of experience in place. Mobile methods such as walking interviews, require bodily movement, facilitate dynamic, reflecting-in-experience in place (Stevenson, 2017) and are very suitable for exploring both how international students construct their experience of place and their experience of everyday or 'banal mobilities' (Wilkinson and Badwan 2021, p.373). Walking generates embodied perception, or knowledge and it seems highly appropriate to situate interviews about a place of interest within the place itself (Evans and Jones, 2011) as being in place may support and inspire participants to talk about feelings and experiences of place (Hitchins and Jones, 2004). Walking interviews combine and evoke bodily and non-bodily aspects, they connect and move us through place in complex ways that can be perceived both literally and figurally (Anderson, 2004) and can evoke multiple temporalities. Walking can also uncover ‘embodied pathways' (Warren, 2017, p. 801) and illustrate how social and cultural factors influence the decisions we make about where and how we move in place. A walking methodology allows participant and researcher to engage with each other
and with place and enables the researcher to attune to the speech and movements of their co-walker. It creates a mobile space for dialogue to unfold, and for bodily sensation to arise in the moment, for example the researcher will ‘feel' the weather and pace of the walks through her bodily sensations. Walking in an everyday place can evoke personal histories, reflections, memories, moods and relationships (O’Neill and Roberts, 2020) experienced through mobility in place. It also may challenge the traditional power relations between the researcher and participant if agency is given to participants to choose the setting, direction and flow of the walk (Clark and Emmell, 2010). Disadvantages of mobile methods may be that they preclude access for participants with disabilities who may not be able to access particular terrains and participant confidentiality may be compromised by walking in public spaces. Participants may be recognised by non-participants who may engage them in conversations that shift the interview's focus and influence the interview data. Confidentiality is perhaps best viewed as ‘a relationally constituted process’ (Klykken, 2022, p. 795) subject to ongoing negotiation, rather than as something fixed and walking interviews may require prior contracting with the participant about managing impromptu social encounters. Walking methods raise questions about the boundaries between the private and the social and may require confidentiality to be seen as a dialogic, potentially changing and changeable process due to their public nature.

Walking interviews and photo-elicitation are methods that can mitigate the impact of potential difficulties in language and lack of shared culture. Both derive information that is additional to discourse and are participant-led. Deriving walking routes and selecting images or other form of artifacts enable the participant to engage in ways that are embodied and visual and to take the lead in constructing meaning. They also
allow for participants to disclose aspects that are pre-reflective as they may go to places that 'feel' welcoming and may choose photographs of places that transmit particular values and resonance. By sharing these experiences and objects, the researcher is invited into a feeling world that can supplement data gathered through discourse. The advantage of positioning these methods ahead of a semi-structured interview is that they allow the interview to be centred on the meanings made of affective experience and offer the creative opportunity for researcher and participant to explore the meanings of embodied and visual experience.

This review of the methods used in contemporary research with international students highlights a key tension inherent in generating data exclusively through discourse in English and a need to pay attention to the implications of this, given that English is not usually international students' first language. As an English researcher studying international students at an English university in English, I seek to mitigate this by introducing embodied methods of generating data through walking interviews and visual methods using photo elicitation. Walking interviews and photo elicitation give primacy to embodied and visual data collection methods which can feed into subsequent semi-structured interviews which offer opportunities to reflect on the experience of walking and the selection of images and can be seen as offering opportunity to participants to lead and initiate data generation.

**Summary**

underline the importance of taking account of others and explored notions of space and place concluding that while place can have particular qualities, it cannot be separated from wider spatial flows, and therefore what happens on Port campus and in Port City is reflective of the wider global, social and political context. I used Lefebvre’s (1991) ideas of space to conceptualize the intertwining of personal, physical and political space to show how place is multifaceted and indivisibly part of a wider socio-political system. I explored forms of mobility such as transnational mobility and academic mobility and asserted the centrality of the body to international doctoral students’ academic and social experience. Then I looked at the relationships between home and international students and identified a Eurocentric discursive positioning of international students as in deficit. Finally I selected and examined methodological aspects of contemporary research with international students and explore some inherent tensions arising from potential cultural and language differences between researcher and participants.
Chapter 3 - Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter I set out my methodological perspective showing how the philosophical underpinnings of this thesis shaped, integrated with, and complemented the methods chosen. This chapter is set out using the APA Style Journal Article Reporting Standards (APA, 2020), including an Overview of the Research Design, Study Participants, Participant Recruitment, Recording and Data Transformation, Data Analytic Strategies and Methodological Integrity. Finally, I address additional ethical considerations.

Research Design Overview

My research questions concern international doctoral students’ experience of Port City campus, paying specific attention to how the campus affects their bodies, and the personal, social and political dimensions of their experience of campus.

Phenomenological Approach

As discussed (Chapter 2, p.15) a phenomenological approach is concerned with understanding the nature and meaning of participants’ experience (Finlay, 2011; van Manen, 2007), and is appropriate to considering the meanings made of campus by the participants in this study.
Summary of the Data-collection and Data-analytic Strategies

I did not aim to uncover an ‘essence’ or ‘truth’ about campus, recognising that history and culture act as a prism for how we perceive and interpret something, and that people can perceive the same object or situation differently. Heidegger (1962) described this as the phenomenon ‘showing’ itself in the way it does to different people.

My philosophical stance acknowledges that our responses to the world are embodied as well as cognitive and emotional (Merleau-Ponty, 2012; van Manen, 2007). The methods chosen, walking interviews, photo-elicitation and semi-structured interviews, enabled the phenomena of campus to be observed in embodied, visual and discursive ways. I took a hermeneutic phenomenological approach to data analysis (Dibley et al., 2020) which enabled me to interpret, as well as describe, participants’ experiences, as a means to uncover underlying and implicit meanings beneath the words. My analytic strategies involved: examining the texts, writing summaries, going back and forth iteratively across the texts in response to the research questions, then using this immersive and in-depth familiarity, I re-approached the texts and collected significant statements (Moustakas, 1994), from which I derived codes, which I then coalesced into themes.

This research embraced the cultural-historical-personal aspects of my participants' experience of being-in-the world (Heidegger, 1962), as I regarded culturally located history and dispositions as potentially useful frameworks to enrich and inform interpretations of experience. I conceived the research process as a relationship, as inter-subjectively created and dialogic.
**Data-Collection Strategies**

To capture participants’ experience of campus, the bodily impacts of this experience, and the explicit and bodily pre-reflective meanings the participants made of it (Merleau-Ponty, 2012), data collection involved multiple and complimentary ways of experiencing campus and exploring meaning making about it. These included walking, talking and photographs.

A hermeneutic approach does not have a fixed set of methodological procedures. Its methods arise from an interplay between the situatedness (time and space) of the research, the research question, the participants and researcher, and are derived from what the research aims to disclose (van Manen, 1990).

In the Literature Review I acknowledged the preponderance of empirical studies into international students utilising semi-structured interviews. I discussed potential methodological tensions arising from reliance on a method that tended to be conducted in the students' second language with a researcher who was outside of their culture. I reflected upon how researchers had attempted to mitigate these barriers by incorporating other methods such as music (Wallace, 2022), photo-elicitation (McLaughlan, 2023) and the selection of artefacts (Brazill, 2021), noting that these methods afforded greater agency to participants as they offered them the opportunity to reflect and construct meaning in advance of an interview. In addition to offering participants greater agency, these methods also appeared to attempt to mitigate these difficulties by reducing the emphasis on eliciting discourse (in English) as the only source of data. Given my decision to use Merleau-Ponty’s (2012) phenomenological, embodied, thinking as the main theoretical structure for this study, I began therefore to consider how I could also seek to derive less discursive, more
embodied, sources of data. These linguistic, cultural and epistemological considerations fed into both the choice and order of methods selected.

I selected a walking methodology as the primary method, as it engaged both body and mind in an active engagement with campus and offered an immersive, embodied, experience of both the main research question, 'How do international doctoral students experience the Port City campus?' and the sub-question, 'How does campus affect students' bodies?' By walking in campus, participants were able to demonstrate, physically express, and reflect on, their relationship with campus and meant that that participant and researcher both had a bodily, visceral experience of the research phenomena. Inviting participants to direct the route, pace and duration of the walks put them in a leadership position in relation to the researcher and afforded them the opportunity to construct their experience of campus through embodied (walking) and discursive means (Clark and Emmell, 2010).

Building on the participant-driven nature of the walking interviews and seeking still to derive data via methods that were not as predominantly discursive as interviews, I asked participants to take 6 photographs of campus and email them to me.

I anticipated that the walking interviews might stimulate a process of reflection about campus and that photographs could augment and yield an articulation of campus to complement the primary method, as it could add a visual dimension to the embodied and discursive data collected through walking. I considered that the images chosen might disclose new aspects and could confer freedom and power to participants, offering them an 'avenue' to guide the course of the research (McLaughlan, 2023, p. 5). I anticipated that reflections, post-walking and the images, could act as aide
memoirs, feeding into and influencing a subsequent interview (Bates, McCann, Kaye and Taylor, 2017) and that the time between emailing the pictures and the follow-up interview would give participants time to dwell with (Finlay, 2011) the meanings of the images chosen.

Hence, having attempted to mitigate the ‘top down’ and essentially discursive, aspects of a semi-structured interview through giving greater primacy to participant-led embodied data collection (walking) and participant-generated data (photographs) I chose to complete my data collection using a semi structured interview on campus in a confidential, private space. These interviews built on the researcher-participant relationships established through walking and enabled participants to explore and contemplate their experiences of campus. The interviews built on the prior participant-centred methods, gave space for further interpretation of campus through discussing their photographs and also allowed for the emergence of other topics.

Having summarized the research design and rationale for the data collection strategies, I explore how these methods link to the underpinning phenomenological theory.

**Walking interviews and Phenomenological Theory**

I asked participants to walk in campus and narrate their experience of campus as a means of enabling them to enact or disclose their embodied connection to campus through the interrelationship between movement and discourse. The walks offered an interpretive opportunity for participants to express their relation to campus in language, whilst walking in campus. This generated perception based on in-the-
moment lived experience rather than abstract or conceptual answers and situated being-in-campus as entwined with the space of doing-in-campus.

I was alert to the socio-cultural dimensions revealed by walking practices for example by attending closely to any discourse about ‘no-go' areas or aspects of the campus that felt unwelcoming or excluding. Equally I attended to aspects such as the pacing of walks, the places where participants chose to stop or to linger, the influence of culture upon perception and the language used to express meaning. I viewed the way participants moved, talked and interacted (with people and space) as an enactment of their personal history and culture, and walking offered a means to access these through the bodily impress of campus. The research disclosed not only participants' bodily engagement with place, but that of those they came into contact with, via how their bodies were perceived and reacted to by ‘others’.

My questions to participants on the walks were minimal, open and designed to elicit narrative about campus, in campus (Evans and Jones, 2011).

I designed the following interview prompts:

Please feel free to comment about anything that comes to mind as we walk around campus together.

How do you feel about this place?

What do you think about when you are walking here?

I discovered that once the walks started, participants seemed to require little more than these prompts to facilitate a narrative and most of my ensuing interventions seemed to involve me reflecting participants' words back to them as a means of
inviting them to unpack their thoughts. The physical motion seemed to evoke conversational mobility with few gaps or silences. The open-ended prompts enabled participants to exercise choice over what they chose to say and how they chose to say it. In comparison to interviews where the interviewer and participant are static, the walking interviews offered spontaneity (Kinney, 2017) and allowed participants to relax, particularly as they walked in a familiar environment (Evans and Jones, 2011; Finlay and Bowman, 2017). This relaxed spontaneity helped to ensure that I received different interpretations of campus, experienced in multiple ways. Walking enabled me to attune to the speech and movements of my participants, creating a mobile space for dialogue to unfold and for bodily sensation to arise in the moment, as a result of the moment. Whilst not walking ‘in their shoes’, I walked, side by side with participants (Butler and Derrett, 2014). Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the walking interviews was that the activity of walking in campus meant that knowledge arose from being in campus but also that the campus environment influenced what emerged in dialogue. Campus both structured and informed the narrative simultaneously (Anderson and Jones, 2009).

Ceding control to the participants meant that one of my interviews was, at their insistence, conducted in driving rain and winds, as she was keen to walk on that day. Another took me on an arduous walk at speed that tested my physical fitness. This meant that as well as listening to their experience, my attention was also taken with keeping dry and pushing my physical comfort zone. I realised that my fear of losing a participant or ‘losing face’ (by exposing my physical fragility) resulted in a lack of assertiveness in asking to reschedule the interview or to slow down. I wondered whether participants may also have had these concerns? Had they felt obliged to
walk on a day and in conditions that they may not have freely chosen?

**Confidentiality**

Walking and talking in a public space like campus meant that student’s confidentiality could not be assured. In some instances, participants' tutors and fellow students came up to us and engaged in conversation with participants, all of whom cheerfully introduced me and explained the research. The openness of the participants in introducing me and explaining the purpose of the research to others may have reflected the particular situated aspect of conducting research with fellow researchers in an academic context, on academic premises, but the engagement with others showed the potential of a walking interview to change from an interpersonal to a wider social process. I had not considered the impact of contributions from non-research participants. I did not use any contents of non-participants' conversation in the analysis as they had not consented to this, but I was aware that their input had the potential to shift participants' focus and influence the interview data. Whilst my information sheet (Appendix 2) detailed aspects of confidentiality around data, it did not address the reality of not being able to provide ‘visual’ confidentiality whilst walking in a public space like campus. In future, I would discuss with participants in advance how they would like us both to respond to impromptu social encounters whilst walking, and possibly reflect with them about the encounter afterwards, as this may have yielded useful data about how social interactions influence experience of campus.
Photo elicitation and phenomenology

In this section, I align photo elicitation to the phenomenological notion of intentionality.

Phenomenology sees consciousness as intentional (Zahavi, 2019), arguing that we cannot be conscious without being conscious of something. Relph (1976) extended the idea of intentionality to incorporate place, suggesting that consciousness is not just consciousness of something but is also consciousness of something in its place. I sought to ascertain participants’ intentional relationship with campus, understanding that what each person may be directed towards would be informed by their history and culture.

Realising that the walks may stimulate additional thinking, I offered participants an opportunity following the walks, to select, photograph and interpret parts of campus that held particular meaning.

Photo elicitation added a visual component to extend verbal methods. Photos disclosed participants’ visual intentionality and were another opportunity to foreground places of interest and significance. Initially I had expected that participants would take pictures as they engaged in the walking interviews. However, when I conducted a ‘dry run’ walking around campus with a colleague, I realised that it was difficult to conduct the walking method and the photo-elicitation method simultaneously. I therefore elected to ask participants to collect 6 images of campus independently, after the walk, and send them to me. They had control over the image and context, the only proviso being that they were required to obtain consent to include images of others (Bennett, 2014). In retrospect, separating the photos from
the walking interviews was a good decision as it afforded participants additional opportunities to think about and interpret campus.

Participants selected the images they wanted to submit to the research, involving processes of inclusion and exclusion, privileging their power of choice.

I reflected that images alone would not convey participants' subjective, multiple meanings of place and, as the focus on the research was the participants' phenomenological meaning, I asked them to reflect upon their images during a subsequent semi-structured interview.

Bennett (2013) suggests that whilst empowering participants, photo-elicitation runs the danger of yielding stage-managed images. This was not a concern I shared, as I saw the photos as visual aspects of intentional meaning making and was confident that the interview would enable me to dig deeper into participants' connection to the photos. The photos were not intended to be interpreted artistically or to be seen as aspects of ‘reality’. I was interested in participants' visions of campus and so use of filters or other editing tools was not problematic, as I interpreted these as expressions of the participants' consciousness rather than as factual documentation.

The images as fragments of daily reality, were temporal and personal. In the interviews, the photos served as conversational prompts and when I looked at students' photos with them, my questions helped them to translate their images into words. Following the interview, I interpreted their words, but did not independently analyse their images as they had been intended as a conversational vehicle for the interviews.
Semi-structured interviews and hermeneutic phenomenological theory

Following the walks and photos, I conducted semi-structured interviews to enable participants to reflect on, interpret and offer discursive meanings not surfaced through the walks or photos. The walking and semi-structured interviews aligned with hermeneutic phenomenology, as they used language to interpret, conceptualise and communicate meaning (van Manen, 2016).

Dialogue enabled speaking about and listening to experience, gave structure and space for speakers to articulate meaning, directed focus and offered recognition and acknowledgement (Dibley et al., 2020). Heidegger (1962) observed that asking questions directs attention and belies a set of implicit judgements. My research contained a construction of participants as people with a response to campus that they recognised and were able to articulate. By posing questions about campus, I was suggesting that campus was a phenomenon of significance. I was mindful that this meant that my questions needed to be open and non-directive, to enable multiple and varied responses beyond those foreseen by me.

The semi-structured interviews contained the following prompts:

Can you tell me about this picture and why you chose to take it?

Can you say a bit more about what this picture tells you about Port City campus?

Is there anything more you would like say about your experience of campus?

The interviews allowed me to explore the meaning of participants' photographs, ask any questions arising from the walking interviews and enabled participants to express any further thoughts arising from the walks and photos.
To create this rich type of dialogue, I used open ended questions, beginning with phrases such as, ‘tell me about’, ‘can you say a bit more about’, designed to elicit description (Dibley, et al., 2020) and encourage both ‘dwelling’ and conversational wandering (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015; Kvale, 1996; van Manen, 2014). I saw my role as co-traveller (Kvale, 1996) rather than interrogator, inviting students to take the lead, explore, wander and digress with the aim of evoking reflection on hitherto unreflected aspects (Merleau-Ponty, 2012). There was the possibility of hearing about distressing experiences that could overwhelm myself as researcher and compromise my capacity to explore and bear with distressing topics. However, my professional role as a counsellor enhanced my researcher skillset (McLeod, 2011), as my training enabled me to hear about and explore distressing experiences without being personally overwhelmed.

Whilst having the photographs available for the second interview ensured that the campus was literally visible during the conversations, participants seemed to talk less about their feelings about the built environment of campus and more about underlying feelings connected to existential themes of safety (racism, insecurity) and meaning (being an international student). I wondered if the safety of being in a confidential, soundproofed room, rather than being outside, may have contributed to this and whether the ‘relational capital’ accrued from the walk created a secure base for participants to talk more deeply about discordant/unsettling aspects of being at Port City. I felt that walking together had engendered trust and that the private interview built upon the walk. This testified to the value of having several methods as each built upon the other and offered different forms of experience.
Following the walking interview, James had completed his viva. In his semi-structured interview, he reflected a great deal on the University’s need to embrace the intellectual contributions of international students. He seemed to be offering a summative reflection on his past experiences, based on finishing his study, and I felt that the interview was a means of speaking to ‘the University’ about the need to value international students (and possibly a tacit reflection of not feeling sufficiently valued).

**Study Participants and Data Sources**

**Researcher Description**

As the researcher, I was part of the context and a co-constructor of knowledge emanating from it. Hermeneutic research accepts the researcher’s influence as an inevitable aspect of the entwined researcher-participant-context (Finlay, 2011). I acknowledge my influence in all stages of the process. I set up the project, used co-participatory methods such as walking and interviews and interpreted the findings. In keeping with this hermeneutic, phenomenological perspective, I argue that my findings were constructed through rigorous and trustworthy processes, which ensure that they have significance, meaning and validity and are not intended to be ‘objective’ representations of a separate, external reality. were nevertheless constructed through rigorous and trustworthy processes. I wove methodological reflectivity throughout this chapter (Finlay, 2011).

I am a counsellor of over 20 years’ experience, and at the time of the study, was manager of Port City University’s Wellbeing Service. I discuss the potential impacts of this on my relationships with participants in the relevant sections. My counselling skills, such as non-directive listening and open questioning, and my ability to stay
with, and explore, difficult and emotionally sensitive topics (McLeod and McLeod, 2022) enabled me to support participants to explore emotionally complicated aspects fully and sensitively (McLeod, 2011).

My experience as a counsellor supported the process of hermeneutic analysis. Counselling involves a capacity for self-awareness and an examination of what I bring to the encounter with my client: how my ways of seeing, understanding, interpreting and relating to them derive from my own experiences and meaning making, and potentially shape the exchange (Finlay, 2022). This capacity to explore myself in relation to others aided me in the critical self-reflection and dialogue with the data required for hermeneutic data analysis (Finlay, 2011). I discuss the impact of this experience on my data analysis in the methodological integrity section.

**Participants - Demographic Information**

I recruited eight international doctoral students for this study. Participants represented a wide range of experience including:

- **Time in the UK:** between 1-8 years
- **Gender split:** 3 males and 5 females
- **Subject areas:** Computing, Education, Digital Art, Geography, Business with Management, Civil Engineering.
- **Relationships and family:** 3 were married with children, 3 were single and 2 were in a relationship.
**Figure 1 - Table of Participant Demographic Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Time in UK</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Relationship status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>PhD Civil Engineering</td>
<td>2 yrs in UK</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>PhD Business with Management</td>
<td>1 year in UK</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>PhD Computing</td>
<td>4 years in UK</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Married with 2 school age daughters. Family living in Port City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>PhD Education</td>
<td>8 years in UK</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Married with 1 school age daughter. Family living in Port City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>PhD Computing</td>
<td>4 years in UK</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Married with 2 pre-school children. Family living in Port City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>PhD Digital Art Technology</td>
<td>1 year in UK</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>PhD Human Geography</td>
<td>4 years in UK</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Living with British partner who was not a student in Port City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>PhD Geography</td>
<td>2 years in UK</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Partner living in London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Researcher-Participant Relationship

I did not have a relationship with any of the participants prior to the research. I shared a connection with the participants as a doctoral student researching other doctoral students and was transparent with participants about my status as a fellow doctoral student and the purpose of my research. As noted above, at the time, I was also a counsellor and overall manager of the university’s Wellbeing Services, a fact I chose not to disclose, as I felt that it may have directed and shaped what participants chose to share with me. It seemed important to uphold a professional boundary by keeping my manager/counsellor role distinct from my researcher role. I did not want implicitly to construct the interviews as a form of therapy. I was also aware that for some international students, issues connected with mental health carried a sense of stigma (Hyun et al., 2010; Forbes-Mewett, 2019; Office for Students, 2019) and as mental health was not the focus of my research, this seemed further good reason not to share my professional role.

Negotiating the role of insider was challenging for me and meant that my counselling skills of advanced empathy became a double-edged sword. I heard about aspects of university life that enhanced participants’ lives (described in the Extend section of the Findings Chapter), but five out of eight participants reported experiences that evoked discomfort in and for them. This was difficult to hear and forced me to re-evaluate the institution I worked for, and to recognise that international doctoral students were subject to different forms of institutional overlooking or passing over. As both an insider and representative of the university, and as a researcher, I found myself pulled in two directions, balancing my loyalty and affection for my employer whilst
acknowledging aspects of institutional life that marginalised some students, and which at times appeared to evoke distress (described in the Interrupt section of the Findings Chapter).

**Participant Recruitment.**

**Participant Recruitment Process and Selection**

I chose to study the experience of international doctoral students, because the length of doctoral study required students to commit to living in Port City for an extended period of time, usually three years, and demanded a more sustained engagement with the campus than for international students studying in Port City for one year. Hopwood and Paulson’s (2012) research with doctoral students concluded that the spaces and places used by students were significant in their academic and personal development. They pointed to a paucity of research into spaces and places and my research sought to extend knowledge in this area.

The sampling strategy was purposive, designed to select people who were international, or non-UK, doctoral students, and ‘illustrative’ (Finlay, 2011, p. 196), because it aimed to evoke these students' experience of the Port City campus. I did not stipulate particular countries, cultures, ages or genders, in line with the directedness of the research towards exploring individual meanings of campus.

The University Doctoral College Administration team agreed to send an invitation email and information sheet explaining the research (see Appendix 1 and 2) to all international doctoral students, and eight students emailed me expressing a wish to be involved. All students who contacted me met sampling criteria as being
international doctoral students engaged in study at Port City University, and all were accepted on to the study.

There are varying recommendations for the sample size for phenomenological research, from three (Giorgi, 2009), three to six (Smith et. al., 2009) or even one (Finlay, 2011). Guided by Dibley et. al’s., 2020) pragmatic question,

Have I gathered enough data to satisfactorily answer the research question? (p.62)

I was satisfied that my sample of eight was a good number to generate the quantity, depth, detail, and complexity to answer the research question and considered that the range of data from 8 participants would enable scope for theoretical and analytical depth within the limits of a 50,000 word thesis.

**Data Collection and Recording**

Appendix 3 sets out the Chronological Overview of the Data Generation Process including the dates, process of data gathering and the word counts of data. I undertook a trial run of the process of data selection on 6/7/2018, and conducted the first walking interview with Steve, on 5/12/2018, concluding the last face to face interview, with Linda, on 13/3/2019.

All participants took part in a walking interview and walking interviews ranged between 40 and 56 minutes. Participants sent me photographs of areas of the campus that had particular meaning for them and met me again for a face-to-face interview after sending me their photographs. The gap between the interviews was in general 2 to 3 weeks (there was a longer gap in James’ interviews, in part because of the Christmas holidays) and the semi structured interviews lasted between 29 and 61
minutes. I recorded both sets of interviews. On the walking interview, participants wore a lapel microphone which ensured a clear record of their words. These interviews were transcribed. The semi structured interview was recorded on a dictaphone. The data comprised transcriptions of both sets of interviews and participants’ images.

After I had obtained ethical approval on 31/10/2018 (Appendix 6) OneDrive was rolled out to all staff. Consequently all participant data, including photographs, were stored on the cloud which eliminated the need for data to be kept in locked filing cabinets or on password-protected computers as stated on the Ethical Protocol form (Appendix 5) and the Information sheet for Walking and Face to Face Interviews (Appendix 2).

Data Analytic Strategies

Data analysis was hermeneutic and phenomenological (Dibley et al., 2020). Before formal coding, I read all the participants’ accounts at least three times to get a sense of any emergent patterns (Peoples, 2021). Then I wrote summaries of each individual participants' interviews. Whilst writing these summaries, I became very familiar with the accounts and wrote down any ideas and potential codes. Following this immersion, I began to notice potential patterns across accounts, and I went back and forth across participants' accounts to explore these. This resulted in a process of formulating and reformulating meaning as I discerned tentative patterns (Dibley et al., 2020) and meant that I was extremely familiar with the texts before I began formal coding.
Below I describe the timeline for the process of data analysis and the methods of this iterative, hermeneutic exploration.

**Timeline**

The data analysis ran from December 2018 to June 2023 and consisted of 3 phases

**Exploration:** December 2018- January 2020

**Re-engagement:** December 2020 – December 2021

**Extending into analysis:** January 2022 – June 2023

**Phase 1 Exploring: December 2018- January 2020**

In this phase, I began explicating and reflecting upon my cultural and historical embeddedness as a white female, accepting that, as a hermeneutic researcher, my horizon of experience shaped what and how I perceived, engaged with, and interpreted, in the students’ experience of campus (Todres, 2007; van Manen, 1990).

I immersed myself reading interview texts, looking at the photos, making space to absorb the data and allow myself to sense underlying and emergent meanings yet to be discovered (Wertz, 1985).

Finlay (2012) sees the prolonged encounter with data as an embodied act of lived experience as well as an academic intellectual one, and as I read through the texts, I vividly remembered the walks and interview. This was occasionally disturbing, particularly the accounts of violence and institutional indifference towards students.

I then ‘dialogued’ with the data (Dibley et al., 2020) by summarising each interview (see Appendix 8 for a sample from James), identifying quotes and tentatively noticing
repeated patterns. This built up a bank of 16 summaries allowing me to go back and forth between them, refining and developing my understanding.

As a next step, I returned to the main research question, 'How do international doctoral students experience the Port City campus?' and put together a document of quotes, putting the students' different notions of campus and city side by side ('What is Place?’, Appendix 9). This foregrounded participants' multiple and varied experiences and showed the complexity and range of response. It afforded a creative way of breaking-in to the data amidst the wealth of data gathered. Thinking about place provided an animating focus. ‘What is place?’ was my creative way of illuminating and positing relationships between the texts as a way of stimulating a creative and unique response to the data (Cohen-Cruz, 2010).  

**Phase 2 Re-engagement- returning to the philosophy: December 2020 – December 2021**

During this phase of returning to the research I found Ahmed’s (2019, 2006) phenomenological texts useful tools to think with as she extends phenomenological thinking to encompass topics of race, culture, and institutional dynamics (see chapter 2 for a fuller discussion of Ahmed). Using Merleau-Ponty (2012) as a core theoretical base, I drew on Ahmed for data analysis and contemporary contextualisation of theory.

In this stage I returned to the texts, fortified by theory and refreshed from time away and I begin a tentative sense-making. I spent time reading and re-reading my

---

2 From January 2020-December 2020 I interrupted my studies due to pressing family circumstances.
summaries and transcripts, allowing myself to notice new aspects. Finlay (2011) regards this stage as a kind of ‘reliving’ and ‘re-embodying’ (p. 229) and advocates lingering.

As a way of re-encountering the data, I wondered about students’ meanings associated with doing a doctorate at Port City. I returned to one of my research sub-questions, ‘What are the personal, social and political dimensions of students’ experience of campus?’ and began reading the interpretive summaries with these different aspects in mind (Appendix 7). I derived ‘The Educational Dream’ (Appendix 10) as a central organising concept containing participants feelings, meanings and possibilities offered through study in the UK. The Educational Dream encapsulated potential and self-expansion and I explicated it for each participant. Then I looked at ways in which campus sustained the Educational Dream and called this Emplacement. This process enabled me to begin to start combining narratives, seeing links and synergies. Although the notions of Educational Dream and Emplacement did not feature in the final findings, they evolved and fed into the final major theme of Extend. They also kickstarted a process of digging deeper into the data.

**Phase 3 Extending into analysis – making meaning: January 2022 – June 2023**

The process of writing commentaries, collecting quotes about campus and city and looking at the academic meaning of being in place (the Educational Dream) meant that when I approached the detailed breaking down of texts, I was supported by this foundational immersion. I broke down the data into ‘significant statements’ (Moustakas, 1994) or quotes about the campus and city that were ‘of direct relevance
to the phenomenon under investigation' (Morrow, et. al., 2015, p.643) (see Appendix 11 for a sample from Steve and Sarah). This process of ‘winnowing’ (Creswell and Poth, 2018, p. 190) involved breaking down over 12 hours of recordings into 388 segments or significant statements. I broke down the data into quotes to keep close to participants' words and to prevent early and over-extensive initial coding.

Once I selected significant statements, I formulated possible meanings and began to see patterns of meaning emerging. This initial identification and engagement with significant statements began a process of meaning formulation which fed into process of initial, tentative and provisional ideas for coding. These provisional codes represented my initial thinking and were intended as food for thought for the future process of final code identification. Below is an example of my engagement with some of Steve's significant statements. I noted the statement and began a process of meaning formulation, for example Steve's statement about strangers being allowed to enter campus suggested to me that freedom of movement in and out of campus was for Steve, a remarkable aspect of the campus environment. I reflected upon the meaning of this statement and formed the notion of freedom of movement in and out of campus (meaning formulation). I interpreted this as culturally significant and tentatively wondered if this might be evidence of a cultural interpretation of the Port City campus in comparison to other campuses Steve had experienced in China and whether this might form the basis of a future code.

In the second example Steve talked about how freedom of movement enables all to 'feel' the campus 'atmosphere'. I reflected upon the choice of the word 'feel' and 'atmosphere' tentatively noticing this statement as a felt or sensual response to
campus, and I noted sensual responses to being-in-campus as a provisional, tentative code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant statements about campus</th>
<th>Meaning formulation</th>
<th>Tentative, Provisional Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strangers may come in. People can walk through.</td>
<td>Freedom for all to enter/porosity</td>
<td>Cultural/ideological aspects of campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyone can just feel the atmosphere about university,</td>
<td>Feeling an atmosphere/feeling campus</td>
<td>Sensual response to being-in-campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My meaning formulation across the significant statements enabled me to be in constant dialogue with the data across the statements. I adopted a 'lean coding' strategy (Cresswell and Poth, 2018, p. 190; Cresswell, 2013, p.184) and aimed to develop no more than between 25-30 codes from the 388 significant statements. Cresswell (2013) advocates lean coding as a means of managing the data and making the subsequent process of condensing codes into themes easier and advocates starting with a 'shortlist' (Cresswell, 2013, p.184) of five or six codes which can be expanded as the researcher reviews the data. Instead of identifying five or six codes, I returned to my research questions and used these as a basis for identifying codes. My research questions identified significant areas of scrutiny, for example the question, 'How do international doctoral students experience the Port City campus?' made me alert to how spatial aspects of campus such as offices and other particular areas of campus were experienced. The question, 'How does campus affect students' bodies?' made me alert to embodied aspects within the data and the question, 'What are the personal, social and political dimensions of student’s experience of campus?' encouraged me to reflect upon those aspects of participants’
experience. Hence my research questions offered a provisional focus on 5 aspects, spatial, bodily, personal, social and political aspects.

I found a 'lean coding' approach to be a good discipline, it encouraged me to dialogue with my data in a constant process of back and forth, whereby I iterated the dimensions of codes and only created additional codes either to identify aspects that could not be encapsulated by other codes, or to highlight particular dimensions. For example, in the table below (taken from Appendix 11) all three responses were initially grouped under 'embodied response'. However, as I worked through the significant statements, I recognised that 'embodied response' contained distinct meaning strands, firstly a sensual response, pertaining to pleasure or feelings of satisfaction, then an embodied response that denoted bodily sensations evoked in campus and finally a response that described the bodily response using metaphor and imagination. This led me to refine my codes increasing them from one to three as a means of explicating these distinct aspects of participants’ embodied experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code name</th>
<th>Explanation of code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensual response to being-in-campus</td>
<td>Eliciting pleasure: beautiful, wonderful, passionate, splendid, feeling of campus (James, Steve, Deborah, Tina, Linda, Phil, Sarah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embodied response</td>
<td>Bodily impress of campus- stress, warm feeling, alone, unable to breathe, bodily attachment to place (Steve, Linda, Deborah, Sarah, Phil, James)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>Campus inspires imagination: arts building inspires passion because it contains colorful bodies; blood metaphor, bloom metaphor (Steve, Hannah, James, Deborah, Sarah)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This resulted in 28 codes which I reduced into 9 themes and 2 overarching themes (see appendix 10). Below I show the process of deriving the theme of 'Being Some Body'.
Deriving a theme

The significance of the office emerged through 2 codes; 'office as a site of community' and 'office as a site of discomfort' (See Appendix 12) with both having distinct and opposing dimensions. 'Office as a site of community' reflected inclusion and social connection, whilst 'office as a site of discomfort' reflected unsympathetic spaces where participants' bodies did not seem to fit in or be supported. 'Office as a site of community' seemed to align with other codes that reflected a sense of inclusion such as the code of 'friendship' which denoted participants' friendships and community found with other international students and with the code of 'embodied familiarity with fellow international students' which expressed the significance of having other international and co-national people to connect with based on shared experience of being international. Drawing on the research question, 'How does campus affect students' bodies?', I saw a link between the three codes of recognition, acknowledgement, being seen and connected with and, using a bodily term, I called the theme, 'Being Some Body'.

In the table below, I offer samples of the significant statements that fed into the code, explain the dimensions of the code which informed the theme of 'Being Some Body'. In Appendix 12, I produced a code book denoting the codes, themes and overarching themes.
### Table showing significant statements, codes, theme for Being Some Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample of significant statements</th>
<th>Code name</th>
<th>Explanation of code</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They’re nice and when they pass by they’ll say hello, or good morning and like that, but it is different in China. In China you have colleagues, but you don’t know them and they will all be by themself, so they may not say hello to you, but here in UK I can feel their kindness (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK)</td>
<td>Office as a site of community</td>
<td>Office offers recognition, a place to be seen and known. Steve’s office consists of international students</td>
<td>Being Some Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an exciting environment for learning, an environment I use for learning, a lot of facilities, I can see my lab … it is a good computer lab …. good facilities, computers, all facilities student needs to use (James, Tanzania, 4th year in UK)</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>It is an exciting place for learning and growth (James)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we used to come here with my friends, colleagues, just chat, laugh, joke, for five, 10 minutes, and then go back into our workshop (James, Tanzania, 4th year in UK)</td>
<td>Office environment offers connection – James later talks about the value of connecting with a range of international colleagues in his office and in other universities.</td>
<td>Office is a sharing space – warm and social.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a social sharing inspirational kind of space. When I’m really excited about an idea and I need to hear someone’s opinion, the office is amazing (Sarah, Singapore. 4th year in UK).</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>Can expect support from fellow Chinese students because they are Chinese. Is he implying that someone who wasn’t Chinese may not have helped?</td>
<td>Being Some Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a nice and warm bubble (Sarah, Singapore. 4th year in UK).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Easier to engage with fellow international students – home students are perceived as not interested in talking with international students (Phil)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of my Chinese friends, also PhD student, he just helped me because we’re all Chinese here (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I noticed that engaging with other international students is much easier with engaging with British students, ……..it’s much easier to communicate with other international students… they [home students] aren’t interested to talk to international students (Phil, Saudi Arabia, 8th year in UK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of them [her friends] are international students, (Tina, Sri Lanka, 1st year in UK)

I have a discussion with another Asian, and in the evening, I may have a good meal with my friends, also from China (Linda, China, 1st year in UK).

I shared my experience with her because she is Korean (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK)

It’s quiet and especially for international students, sometimes we need to talk to other people, we don’t want to be alien..... the class I’m the only Asian ... and I go to our office and I’m the only international, so I’m totally alone in the British culture (Linda, China, 1st year in UK).

I used to come here, exactly in this garden here, to relax here... I used to come with another international PhD student. We used to come here and sit and talk about issues like about moving to places (Phil, Saudi Arabia, 8th year in UK)

I was writing a conference paper. Behind me were some undergraduate students, they were from Egypt, and they made a lot of jokes... I started to laugh. These kinds of things, actions, they come to you, you have a break and laugh ... I talked with them .... I need these things (Hannah, Saudi Arabia, 4th year in UK)

Tina’s social life is mainly international students

Linda notices that her friends are Asian

Embodied familiarity with fellow international students

Feels able to talk about personal things with his supervisor because she is Korean (and so international)

Being the only international person makes her feel ‘totally alone’. Associated talking with other international students as necessary otherwise will feel ‘alien’.

Uses the garden to talk about moving to UK with a fellow international student- sense of shared understanding and shared experience is relaxing.

Hannah feels empowered to approach international students in a way that she does not in her office which is mainly home students. She feels familiarity as the students are talking in Arabic, a language she shares – this contact gives her what she needs
around four of them are students from India, culture-wise we are different, but we are really close on the map. I am a Sri Lankan but I'm a part of the Indian culture and society because I have a lot of Indian friends. (Tina, Sri Lanka, 1st year in UK)

So if students know, especially students from Sri Lanka, that there are more Sri Lankans in the campus, they would be more willing to come because they would have like a community here (Tina, Sri Lanka, 1st year in UK)

Tina derives social benefit, friendship from being with those who are geographically closer to her home country- sees geography as offering familiarity.

The need for familiar students like herself to create a community.

Final Themes

Six of the nine themes, in keeping with one of the research questions, reflected different aspects of embodied experience.

Being Some body – reflecting the experiences of being related to and 'seen' by fellow international students and others as being part of the environment (in a context in which being ‘seen,’ acknowledged and connected with does not always take place, so the fact and the way that these things happen becomes worthy of note).

Bodily imagination – reflecting the metaphorical meanings made by participants of their own and others’ bodies in particular places

Not Body – reflecting different experiences of social exclusion

No Body – perceptions to silence themselves and not talk about difficult experiences to white others

Any Body - perceptions of indifference towards participants
Contested body – participants' presence in place is questioned by others based on others' associations with their skin colour.

The other 3 themes were

Conceptual thinking – campus inspiring ideas about theirs and others' stance towards the world

Campus as consolation – spaces that support and soothe

Embedded cultural values – experience of campus evoking ideas about different forms of freedom and individualism

**Overarching themes**

Following identification of the 9 themes I saw a distinct split between them. Five themes denoted processes of growth and development where participants' meaning making was enlarged whilst four themes suggested a process where participants' 'being-in-the-world' (Zahavi, 2019, p.66) was interrupted by problematic experiences. I termed these processes overarching themes as they subsumed the existing nine themes. Reflecting on Ahmed's (2007) thinking about interruption to the bodily schema, I called the overarching theme reflecting growth and development 'Extend', seeking to describe how the participants inhabited the Campus in ways that enlarged them, and the other 'Interrupt', seeking to denote ways the participants' presence and engagement was modified or prevented.

This combination of codes into themes, and then into two overarching themes is represented diagrammatically below:
Figure 2a – Extend Diagram

- **Conceptual Thinking**
  Sensual response to being-in-campus, Embodied response, Cultural comparison, Campus as part of identity formation.

- **Some Body**
  Office as a site of community, Friendship, Embodied familiarity with international students.

- **Bodily Imagination**
  Imagination.

- **Embedded Cultural Values**
  Cultural/ideological aspects of campus.

- **Campus as Consolation / Overcoming Barriers**
  Familiar places, Campus as restorative, Intelligible places.
Figure 2b – Interrupt Diagram

- **Not Body**: Spatial isolation, Language, Office as a site of discomfort, Invisible bodies, Excluded from social participation.
- **No Body**: British Bodies, White fragility, Perceived value of self to the university.
- **Contested Body**: Standing out, Racial attacks, Contested bodies, Lingering of distressing experiences in the body, Ability to identify with others using own experience, Double consciousness.
- **Any Body**: Institutional indifference, Helplessness.
Methodological Integrity

Ethical Approval

Ethical Approval for this project was granted on 31/10/2018 (Appendix 6) and extended on 19/10/21 (Appendix 7).

Adequacy of Methods and Data in Answering research Questions.

My research questions were concerned with how the participants experience the Port City University campus, how the campus affected their bodies, and the personal social and political dimensions of their experience of campus.


I took a hermeneutical phenomenological approach (Dibley, et al., 2020; Finlay, 2011) to analysing my data, and conceptualising the nature of my findings, aiming to recognize the importance of context and complexity in knowledge generation and the participants’ experience, rather than to try to arrive an at ‘essence’ of truth through the method of phenomenological reduction described by Husserl (Zahavi, 2019).
My methods of data gathering derived from this philosophic conception of my project, incorporating embodied, visual and discursive approaches that enabled participants to experience (walking), show (photographs) and articulate (semi-structured interviews) their processes of meaning making about campus.

I discussed how my methods sought to address some methodological limitations of semi-structured interviews and have shown the consistency of my methods with my philosophical stance.

**Researcher Positioning.**

Hermeneutic research inevitably involves the researcher’s being-in-the-research. I used my experience as counsellor to help inform my reflexive awareness of my role in gathering and analysing the data.

I maintained a critical, reflexive process throughout the research, seeking to remain open to new meanings and avoid pre-determining research outcomes (Finlay, 2003). Identifying my pre-understandings meant I surfaced self-awareness that enabled me to maintain a questioning stance, seek out differing understandings and ensure that I did not map my experiences on to the students.

In respect of gathering the data, the participants selected were those who expressed a wish to take part in the research, and I have described the process of data gathering. My counselling skills such as non-directive listening and open questioning, and my ability to stay with, and explore, difficult and emotionally sensitive topics (McLeod and McLeod, 2022) enabled me to listen fully and compassionately (McLeod, 2011). I ensured that participants shaped the direction and content of both the walking interviews and photo-elicitation which underpinned the semi-structured
interview. Each interview followed a different course, discursively led by the participant, and I used my practice of reflexive self-awareness to ensure that, as in a counselling interview, I was present, and that I facilitated the participants in elaborating the meanings and experiences they chose to share but did not lead or direct them (McLeod, 2011).

The extent to which these processes of data gathering led to participants providing individually variable data is demonstrated in the Findings Chapter and through the examples of coding and theme generation provided above. I suggest this variability indicates the degree to which the research process enabled participants to explore and express their particular experiencing and processes of meaning-making in the gathering of data.

In respect of data analysis, the nature of hermeneutic research involves generating new knowledge through the researcher interpreting participants' interpretations. This involves a process of constant dialogue between the multiple data sources and requires critical self-reflection. I consistently explicated my connection to the research to surface biases or blocks to thinking that could limit my openness to new understanding and to open myself up to synergies or different ways of connecting with the research, a process that mirrors my practice as a counsellor.

I see reflexivity not a something to be explicated once, but as an interwoven strand of the process and project and used research-journaling and self-reflective skills acquired through over twenty years of practice to facilitate this process of self-other awareness. I constantly reflected and journalled about my responses to the data, striving to ensure that ‘bias' (Gadamer, 1996) did not obscure the participants' voices.
or meaning. I explored the connections between participants' and my meanings, probing the synergies, contrasts and agreements to open up new meanings. I maintained a dialogic relationship between my participants' meaning making and my own, going back and forth between my assumptions and their experiences as means to connect with the data as it presented itself, rather than simply seeing it through my expectations or prior generalisations (Finlay, 2003). By identifying my thoughts, assumptions and values evoked through the research, I explored my ‘horizon’ or perspective (Gadamer, 1996) which helped me to see its limits and possibilities. I saw different perspectives more clearly, recognising in their otherness the potential for new meanings to be made through a ‘fusion of horizons’ between mine and others (Gadamer, 1996).

**Rigour and Evaluation: Tracy’s ‘Big Tent’ Criteria**

I selected Tracy’s (2010) ‘Eight’ ‘Big-Tent’ Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research’ as a framework to evaluate my research (see Appendix 13) and highlight three of those below. The other aspects are considered in different chapters of this thesis (summarised below).

*Figure 3 – Tracy’s ‘Big Tent’ Criteria*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Worthy Topic</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Rigour</td>
<td>Addressed below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>In Methodology and subsequent chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Addressed below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonance</td>
<td>Below, Discussion and Conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Rich rigour**

I collected multiple forms of data via walking interviews, photo elicitation and face to face interviews and yielding ‘a rich complexity of abundance’ (Tracy, 2010, p. 841) of recorded experience. I detailed the advantages and disadvantages of my data collection tools and clearly outlined above my data analysis procedures including illustrative samples to show transparency in the ‘sorting, choosing and organising’ (Tracy, 2010, p. 841) of my data.

**Credibility**

I include a varied, sample of ‘thick’ descriptions and quotes both in the findings chapter and in the code book (Appendix 9) which details how each code applied across the data set, to demonstrate that I was not stretching data from one or two participants to apply across the whole sample.

Phenomenology, with its focus on the unreflective or taken-for-granted aspects of lived experience, is an ideal means to disclose contextual processes that shape lives without themselves being noticed. I showed how my coding and identification of themes came together to create a credible composite account of how campus extends and interrupts students. This surfaced genuine, hitherto unexplored, insight about the campus.
A weakness of my research was that it did not formally include participant verification. I did not offer participants the opportunity to read their transcripts. However the iterative nature of the data collection steps gave students the chance to build upon and extend their thinking over time. In the final face-to-face interview, all drew upon their experience of the walk around campus and discussed their photographs. This enabled them to clarify, refine and extend their thoughts.

**Resonance**

The results relate to a particular university in a specific location in a specific time. Yet I believe the methods and analysis extend Ahmed’s (2006) thinking about how institutions can ‘orient’ the inner and outer worlds of those who inhabit them. I drew on her thinking to reconceptualise campus as a process as well as backdrop and generated two overarching themes, extend and interrupt, to show how campus inspires and impedes participants. This has utility for other researchers of campus and offers a theorisation of campus that is neither materialist (Dewey, 1916) nor new materialist (Bennett, 2010; Barad, 2007), yet recognises the power of space as an entity. The results may also have resonance for scholars of institutional racism (Bhopal, 2018; Andrews 2022) who may find that the examples resonate with other studies.

The notions of embodied familiarity and embodied particularity that emerge through this study may also inform further embodied, phenomenological theorising about intersubjectivity.
Ethical Considerations arising from the research process.

My ethical decisions evolved from Port City University’s guidelines (see Appendix 4) and this section addresses ethical issues arising from the research process.

Consent

Prior to meeting students, I sent out an information Sheet (Appendix 2) stating the research aims, procedures and steps taken to care and protect participants. When they arrived for the walking interview, I went through the consent form (Appendix 3), mindful that English could be a second language. As my participants were doctoral students, they expressed their familiarity with the process. This may have led me to be over-confident that this initial meeting was sufficient to secure informed consent across the range of methods, as I subsequently failed to readdress consent in the face-to-face interview. On reflection I would readdress the consent form at each iterative stage of the research process.

Protection from harm

Steve was subject to a verbal assault whilst walking with me. I checked out how he felt about this and whilst he was unhappy at being shouted at by a stranger, he expressed that

So now I think it’s very normal because I always meet with things like that. It sometimes makes me very helpless (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, walking interview)

I checked out with him whether he wished to continue with the interview and he affirmed that he did. I found the incident frightening. Never having experienced this type of incident before, I instinctively felt a wish to stop the interview and advertise
the University’s counselling and wellbeing services. Internally I debated the merits of doing this, before deciding that doing so may have felt like a directive or suggestion that the incident warranted counselling. Given Steve’s reflection that this was a familiar experience for him, I felt a concern not to impose my distress onto him (DiAngelo, 2011) and was aware that my Information Sheet contained signposting to services in case of distress.

In Steve’s face-to-face interview, he spoke about being punched in the eye by a local man and about a Police Officer privately arranging to pay Steve for his glasses that were broken by the punch. The Police Officer protected the attacker, and there were no proceedings. In my doctoral supervision, we discussed whether there was an ethical need for me to do any further action such as reporting it to the university (or Police), but in the interests of protecting Steve’s autonomy and confidentiality, and in recognition that he was an adult with capacity, we decided not to do so. Whilst I think this was the right decision, it raised questions about balancing issues of research participant autonomy to tell their story against my wish to respond to issues of oppression and racial injustice. Ultimately, my hope is that this research will enhance awareness of the difficulties faced by institutions and individuals in hearing and supporting students who receive injustice, and I hope that this research contributes to a narrative about the complexity of relationships between minorities and institutions.

Insider loyalties and the ethics of truth-telling

The ethics of pseudonyms

I protected the identity of my participants by allocating pseudonyms (Cresswell, 2013). As international doctoral students are a small group, I was keen to enhance their confidentiality by giving students common British names. As the focus of the
study was the phenomenology of campus, rather than the influence of culture, I speculated that British pseudonyms might help me to keep the focus on campus as a process and consequently selected eight common British names.

I considered allocating names that denoted participants' ethnicity but, for example, when I googled 'common Chinese male names', I realised that as I did not speak the language, I did not have the cultural awareness to discern whether the names suggested were appropriate. It seemed more important to avoid unintentionally selecting names that could be offensive or inappropriate (Allen and Wiles, 2016). I considered using an alphanumerical code e.g. S1 for student 1 or F2 for female student 2, but rejected this as dehumanising and distancing from the relationship I had with the participants. Allen and Wiles (2016, p. 5) regard pseudonyms as a ‘nuanced act of research, affected by issues of power and voice,’ and regard the allocation of pseudonyms by a researcher without consultation and negotiation with participants as ‘paternalistic’. I accept this charge and recognise that by not offering participants the chance to determine their own pseudonym, I unintentionally missed an opportunity for participants to have agency over how they were represented. I will do this differently in future research.

Summary

This chapter set out a detailed overview of my data collection and data analysis processes and showed how the methods reflected and integrated phenomenological theory to yield a rich set of complex data. I reflected upon my role, my ethical responsibilities and identified my learning derived from conducting the research.
Chapter Four - Findings

Introduction

This research investigated participants' experience of campus. Whilst walking with me, participants described their responses to the campus. The findings detail commonalities in participants' processes of engagement, underpinned by Merleau-Ponty's body schema (2012) and consist of two key overarching themes, Extend and Interrupt. I began by using Merleau-Ponty's (2012) body schema (see Chapter 2) as a lens on the data, to reveal tacit aspects of participants' lived experience and the bodily impress of campus. I used and adapted Ahmed's creative terminology of extend and interrupt, to derive these two key overarching themes, and applied them to the participants' experiences of Port campus and city. Although I used Ahmed's terminology as an inspiration, I developed and illuminated my own multiple dimensions of each overarching theme, which I derived from the particularity of the findings which paid on-the-ground, granular, attention to specific, individual experiences of embodiment.

In presenting my analysis, I included some participants' photos to illustrate how they depicted participants' particular visual intentionality towards campus. The photos added a sensual component to their dialogue with me and having the photos present in the interviews provided an animating focus and afforded participants agency to extend and direct the conversation. The photos formed a significant aspect of participants' meaning making and, in some cases, depicted everyday spatial practices. I integrate the photos into the analysis to reflect how they complemented
the participant-researcher dialogue. I also reflect upon the 'untaken photos' and link these to unseen experiences.

When participants extend, their bodies move in the campus easily, they apprehend the world, take it in and develop satisfying embodied, unselfconscious, interconnected relationships with their environment. Using Ahmedian terminology, when participants extend, they 'inhabit' (Ahmed, 2007, p. 161) the positive, are active in a creative co-creation of the world, flow into campus with bodily ease and satisfaction, and experience themselves as having bodily possibility.

When participants are interrupted, their body schema is disrupted. Instead of experiencing an unselfconscious relationship, they become aware of a discordance between their embodied sense of self and their environment. Their flowing progress in the world is stopped, forcing them consciously to reconsider their relationship with their environment. They become self-conscious and find that aspects of the world are not automatically available to them. Extending gives participants a sense of a bodily, 'I can' (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p. 139). When they are interrupted, they find themselves having to accommodate to a bodily notion of 'I can not' (Staudigl, 2012, p.32). To be interrupted is 'to inhabit the negative', to 'be not' (Ahmed, 2007, p. 161). Interrupt identifies processes that erase, question, overlook and lack concern for participants, and indicate failure to recognise and respond to participants' embodied particularity in institutional, personal and civic domains.

The overarching theme of Extend encapsulates five themes:

1.1. Evoking conceptual thinking

1.2. Inducing bodily imagination
1.3. Conveying embedded cultural values

1.4. Overcoming barriers

1.5. Being Some Body

The overarching theme of Interrupt encapsulates four themes:

2.1. Any Body

2.2. Not Body

2.3. No Body

2.4. Contested Body

All of the findings answered the main Research Question, 'How do international doctoral students experience the Port City campus?' with different themes corresponding to the dimensions of the research sub questions as depicted in Figure 4 below.

Figure 4: Grouping of themes in response to the Research Questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research sub-questions</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does campus affect students' bodies?</td>
<td>1.5 Being Some Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Any Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Not Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**What are the personal, social and political dimensions of student’s experience of campus?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Evoking Conceptual Thinking (Personal dimension)</td>
<td>1.2 Inducing Bodily Imagination (Personal dimension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Conveying embedded cultural values (Social dimension)</td>
<td>1.4 Overcoming Barriers (Social dimension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Being Some Body (Social dimension)</td>
<td>2.2 Not Body (Social dimension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 No Body (Political dimension)</td>
<td>2.4 Contested Body (Political dimension)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1. Extend

Extend describes how campus inspires participants’ imagination, creativity and meaning-making potential, and how they create satisfying social relationships based on shared bodily familiarity as international students. Participants' relationships with campus are reciprocal, involving a bodily interrelationship with campus, where elements of the world come together to form a specific, intentional campus experience. Campus participant interactions are active and continuous and generate new situated knowledge. Apart from Deborah, all participants used campus-based reflections to engender new thinking about identity. Campus evokes emotion, inspires
imagination and triggers conceptual thinking, where aspects of campus such as the sky, building works and computer equipment stand in for ease, continuous progress and institutional care. Participants’ interpretations of campus involve comparison between their pasts and present which, alongside imagination, forms an integral part of their interpretation of campus.

In addition to their use of campus, participants connect with other international bodies. The shared identification of being an international student inspires relationships between international students, allowing them a form of bodily extension and community based on a shared familiarity of being a minority group on campus and in the city.

1.1 Evoking conceptual thinking

The theme evoking conceptual thinking responds to the research question, ‘What are the personal dimensions of student’s experience of campus?’. Participants’ sensual responses to campus were individual. They connected viscerally with different aspects that disclosed particular possibilities. Campus, perceived in and through the body, brought forth ideas about theirs and others’ stance towards the world. This emerged in profound bodily metaphors where an association with a building inspired James to reflect on how his blood was ‘in’ academia. Steve saw passion as emanating from a building used by arts students. Hannah’s bodily identification with a flower gave her hope that she too would ‘bloom’, and she saw her office colleagues as located ‘in’ their computers. They used these bodily responses to campus to construct meaning about themselves and linked identities to aspects of campus such as academic belonging (James), creativity and art (Steve), hope and exclusion (Hannah). They used their sensual connections with buildings, flowerbeds and
computers to express creativity and grasp the human potential of self-in-campus to construct their subjectivity. These sensual responses show how spatiality expresses itself in the body schema (Merleau-Ponty, 2012) enabling students to use objects or buildings freely to extend their understanding of self and others (Garavito, 2019).

Participants have a generative relationship to campus, where being-in-campus inspires a sensual, felt response that generates new thinking. It inspires perceptions about how beauty benefits the world and the bodies of those who perceive it, how building works evoke wonder and represent a will towards institutional progress, how computer equipment conveys care and how concrete constrains and entraps those working inside its structures.

Steve often spent time looking at the sky out of a window in his office. The view from the window in his office inspired reflections about a world beyond buildings, elicited a sensual response, ‘beautiful’, and evoked comparison with views in China. He used the sky view to generate thoughts about what it did to his perception of the world, using the environment to create new understanding, suggesting that the sky ‘makes the picture better’. As Steve engaged with the view, he thought about what it could offer him, inspiring him to link it with the potential to reduce bodily stress. Steve’s experience showed the potential of campus to offer a new awareness of self-in-the-world.

I stand there. The scenery is very good, especially when it gets darker and you can see the sunset. It’s really beautiful. In China now there are a lot of high-rise buildings, and you can’t even find the sky. Do you know what I mean? When I look up above all the high-rise buildings, like this one here, you can
see the clouds and the sky. The sky is beautiful. It makes the picture better. I like the sky (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, walking interview).

Following the walking interview, Steve submitted six photos, of which four contained substantial backgrounds of skies of different hues, set alongside city buildings, like the one depicted in Figure 5 below which was taken from the same office window that he and I had looked out of on our walking interview.

This one is just from that window in my office, I took the picture from that window. It’s in the evening and because it’s very dark so you can see cars, all the people are coming back home. The sky is very beautiful (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, semi-structured interview).

The prominence of sky illustrated the power of Steve’s images to depict environmental differences inspired through relocation and the phenomenological process of his visual orientation towards campus. He sought to include the sky in his images because it offered difference and beauty and enhanced his sensual and embodied experience.

The view triggered an associative process culminating in an idea that engaging with a view has embodied impacts, making a person feel better.

I think it can help me, because as we are researchers, sometimes we’ll feel very stressed. Here, maybe because of the environment, maybe because of natural things, I can feel that it is not that stressful compared to Shanghai. In China the students may be more stressed than here, I think (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, semi-structured interview).
James associated the library’s building works with continuing improvement and growth, seeing them as a sign of a ‘good’ and ‘wonderful’ building and of change and innovation. The building works signified a university that was refreshing itself. James imbued the library with positive feelings derived from its appearance, associating it with an institutional will towards unceasing technological progress.

It’s very, very good, I never saw such kind of wonderful library because of all the different renovations. Every time, restructuring. Even now, as soon as I go for my Christmas holiday, I’m sure they will be doing something. We have no such kind of building. There are buildings but not like this, it’s totally different. The kind of engineering, the structuring, the glass, you can see automatic
doors. It's the Western architecture, kind of renovation everywhere (James, Tanzania, 4th year in UK, walking interview).

James saw the library and had an emotional response which he applied first to the whole building and then to the wider environment. The view of the building suggested cutting-edge technological and engineering progress. He used what he saw happening on the outside of the building to conceptualize the entire building as 'wonderful' and applied this to the wider environment seeing improvements 'everywhere'. He projected his consciousness of the library towards a 'western' cultural attitude about architecture, which was synonymous with perpetual evolution.

He took a photograph of the library (Figure 6) and during our semi-structured interview was keen to prioritize discussing it, directing me to move through other images to focus on it.

So, I think now you can go to the most important building, it's not here, I think maybe, the next photo is the university library. This is the most important building .... That is where everything is made, that's where innovation comes from .... any new ideas it's coming from the library .... it's a really, really important place (James, Tanzania, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Whilst outside walking James used the external appearance of the library as the focus for his reflections but during the semi-structured interview held indoors, he used the photograph as a means to discuss the importance of the activities that happened inside the building showing how the methods of walking, photo-elicitation and semi-structured interviews fed on each other and combined to produce an
encompassing discussion of the significance of the library's external appearance, the activities carried out inside it and its wider signification of progress and renovation.

Figure 6 – Picture of the library (James).

Linda equated the allocation of computer equipment with institutional care, which attracted the envy of her friends, in a perceptual process where campus stimulated an interplay between the material (equipment, the classes), the abstract (institutional caring) and the existential (talking about wellbeing).

They gave me the laptop and the screens. I have three screens. I took a photo and posted it on social media, other people were envious. The university guy told me that the laptop screen is too small, and if we work a long time with
screens, we need a big one. So, they gave me the big one. It really surprised me. I think it’s really humane. Before that no-one had asked about mental health or physical health at work. It seemed that we needed to take care of our health ourselves, but here they think about that. It really makes me feel warm (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, semi-structured interview).

The equipment brought mental and physical health into focus, which Linda interpreted as the university’s care for her embodied experience. The objects evoked a disposition towards the wider institution as ‘humane’. She interpreted the equipment as a proxy for wellbeing support, and as representing the institution’s care towards its students, which she saw as also reflected in the university’s provision of campus-based wellbeing sessions for postgraduate researchers. The sessions were a space where ‘failings’ could be spoken about, evoking a negotiation between talking and not talking about mental health, and engendering a cultural shift in her perception of the benefits of talking about mental health.

In Asian culture we do not usually express our failings directly. Sometimes we don’t know what kind of failing is not normal, is not common as we are already too stressed. I think sometimes if we can have some courses, or some information, to tell us how to measure what is not normal, tell us when we need to get some help, that is good. I found it’s a really good thing to have an opportunity to talk about those things. I thought wow, it’s really good thing (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Figure 7 is Linda’s photograph of the computer equipment. She mentioned that she had shared another picture of this equipment on social media as a symbol of
institutional caring that was envied by her friends, suggesting that the provision of this equipment was something meaningful. Her image can be seen to convey a socio-cultural value (valuing positive mental and physical health) beyond the subject of the photo (the equipment). By sharing images with others via social media and Figure 7 with me as researcher, she curated a celebratory, visual narrative of herself as institutionally cared for.

Figure 7 – Picture of Linda’s office equipment

Steve, James and Linda were directed towards consciousness of campus as progressive and as offering different benefits beyond their prior experience.

Whilst Deborah’s response to campus was less favourable, she applied similar imaginative processes and conceptual thinking to elucidate the existential impacts of
the campus environment. She found the campus hard to occupy, comparing the concrete aspects of campus to an authoritarian regime which constrained her body, afforded her minimal influence over her situation and left her looking forward to leaving. She likened campus to,

A Soviet bloc because of the concrete (Deborah, USA, 4th year in UK, walking interview).

Compared to her previous universities, she found it small and old fashioned, 'very 1970s' and described her laboratory as resembling 'a mental institution' where she was 'enclosed in concrete all day'. She saw campus as a site of bodily oppression, a harsh, unyielding environment where she was obliged to stay. Her offices were airless and stuffy, with no means of altering the ventilation which made her,

feel like I'm falling asleep up there because I can't breathe (walking interview)

She perceived her only choice was endurance,

I mean it is what it is. So I just kind of deal with it, I'm only here temporarily, like a couple of years, is kind of how I look at it (Deborah, USA, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Whilst Deborah's campus constrained and confined her body and did not support the development of her mind, it enabled her to deploy imaginative metaphors to depict her bodily experience and stimulated a form of conceptualisation that was paradoxically creative. For all, campus was infused by memories of past campuses, past buildings and diverse cultural references, testifying to the influence of mobility on meaning making.
1.2 Inducing bodily imagination

The campus inspires participants' imaginative thinking about their and others' bodies. Inspired by the physical environment, they use bodily imagination to express a felt atmosphere about university which responds to the research questions, 'How does campus affect students' bodies?' and 'What are the personal dimensions of student's experience of campus?'. In their place-body processing, participants fuse reflections about body and place to form a conception of identity, suggesting a role for campus in identity formation. An arts building became a site of passion, a library had a channel of blood running through it and a flower was a student waiting to bloom.

The outside of a building inspired Steve’s imaginative thinking about the people who used it and their emotional orientation to study. He noticed their bodies and used his observations to make meaning about other students' emotional orientation to the world. He reflected upon the building’s function as an arts school and imagined different colours emanating from the building. The building evoked an atmosphere of passion which he applied to the bodies of students, using it to understand them.

I've never been in here. This place is for art, so all the people in the building, they work with passion. They're very passionate about their clothes and their hair, very passionate. Different colours I think, from this building (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, walking interview).

The building was a formative aspect in his sense making about other students, facing him with students who were different to him, and inspired meaning derived from his interpretation about their bodies expressing their identities as art students.
In our semi-structured interview, I asked Steve why he had chosen to take a picture of the building (Figure 8) and he replied,

    So, this building – I just care about the people there, they’re all very fashionable (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Steve chose to photograph a building in which art is taught to show his care for people who used it, the building represented the people within it and evoked feelings of benevolence towards their expression of self through fashion and colour. The discussion of the photo in the semi-structured interview widened my understanding of Steve’s response to the art students introducing a felt dimension of care. Discussion of the photo enabled Steve to disclose an emotional feeling for the students adding a personal dimension to his relationship with campus.
James saw the library and experienced an embodied response that triggered a flow of meaning making, which culminated in a poetic metaphor describing his blood running through 'academia', a bloodline that could not be redirected anywhere else. The building evoked an atmosphere of 'being at university' which he metaphorically applied to his body.

I think this building is new. The newness, the appearance, the structure, the appearance of the environment, you feel it. Oh I’m studying at university. I feel like even my blood now is into academia, my blood is in it, I can’t go anywhere else, I can’t go to work in the industry (James, Tanzania, 4th year in UK, walking interview).
The ‘appearance’ of the library evoked a feeling, which inspired a metaphor of taking in academia into his blood, to conceptualise his sense of an irreversible academic identity. James and Steve reached towards aspects of the campus and drew on their bodily awareness to understand the impact of campus on theirs and others' bodies, which they used to develop thinking about identity.

Hannah used a metaphor to illustrate an interwoven, body-place encounter in her description of a flower in a flowerbed near her office. The flowerbed evoked comfort, refreshment and energy in a sensual response that brought together sight and smell. Looking at the flower evoked optimism about an organism’s potential for growth and beauty. She identified with the flower’s potential, entwining her bodily response (sight and feeling) with the flower’s beauty to come ‘in the summer’. The flower was a metaphor for growth towards a blooming to come, at the end of a period of waiting, a state that Hannah explicitly applied to herself.

When you look at something green or something like that, it makes you feel comfortable. For me the smell, especially in the morning when you walk up and smell the green. It makes you feel refreshed, and it increases your energy. The flower is just growing up. It’s still small but I believe in the summer it will be beautiful. I see it every day. Every day I see this plant and I see how it has grown up. Yeah, so I’m waiting to bloom (Hannah, Saudi Arabia, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Hannah took the photo of the flowerbed because it was part of her everyday life. When she looked at the photo, she recalled the flowerbed in other years, noticing the
different colours of flowers across time. The flowerbed seemed like a point of continuity across time.

Every year they plant different flowers, so this year they have this one, but last year they planted orange flowers and yellow, it was orange and yellow, and this year I know it’s going to be purple (Hannah, Saudi Arabia, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

The photo enabled her to articulate the development of an everyday spatial practice giving a richer understanding of the potential role of the campus environment to evoke a sense of temporal continuity.

Hannah saw the flower ‘every day’, revealing how she incorporated an aspect of the material environment into an embodied habit that suggested hope for the future, in a period that seemed fallow. Her response to the flowerbed was of feeling refreshed showing the intermingled bodily impacts of their imaginative flow. The participants' intentional directedness towards these particular aspects of their environment enabled them to occupy it in satisfying ways.
1.3 Conveying embedded values

The theme of conveying embedded values responds to the research question, 'What are the social dimensions of student's experience of campus?'. Participants’ perception of material structures contained their interpretations about how these structures transmitted cultural values which had implications for their social experiences. Academic space could include non-academics, intellectual discussion could include diverse opinions, buildings could foster independence and a less communal way of living and the configuration of an office could preclude social interaction. These spatially-embedded cultural values had direct social impacts showing the intertwine of the social with the cultural. In these ways therefore, this theme addresses the research question about the social dimensions of participants' experience of campus.
The spatiality of campus conveyed an institutional attitude, and its material structures seemed to transmit embedded values that affected the activities of those using it. Participants' perceptions of campus entwined observation, interpretation about the university’s attitude towards its students and interpretation linking campus to particular cultural values and particular forms of behaviour.

In a flowing, intentional process, participants noticed campus’s openness to others, its visible religious buildings, its lack of mass student accommodation and its empty offices. Although they interpreted these experiences in different ways, each interpretation pointed towards participants perceiving a campus orientation towards something, such as support for the whole person, intellectual openness, freedom of choice and a devaluing of students. These interpretations linked with and fed into interpretations about how campus promoted different values, such as inclusion, freedom of thought, individualism and institutional thoughtlessness. Participants suggested that these aspects of campus exemplified and encouraged particular cultural attitudes including tolerance, academic freedom, freedom to enjoy life and disinvestment in the office as a site of social life.

Steve noticed that the campus design made it open to non-students and reflected upon how physical openness to others conveyed an institutional value of inclusivity and tolerance. Campus’s design permitted an openness to ‘others’ which he connected with an existential freedom for all to pursue wider interests. The campus conveyed a sense of the person beyond the academic. The permeable boundary between town and university offered people the opportunity to ‘feel their atmosphere about university’. His use of the word ‘their’ pointing to a notion of perception as phenomenological, consisting of an interaction between the university and each
person’s perspective. Steve associated a ‘feeling’ of campus as offering informal learning about university to non-students, and as conveying permission to be more than study, linking bodily perception with conceptual meaning making and existential possibilities.

In this university, strangers may come in. In China, they should get a permit. In China, there is a building for the university and a building for another purpose. This is the difference, I think. More open. People can walk through (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, walking interview).

The potential of an academic site to contain non-academic people offered a new sense of campus as one that valued other aspects as well as study.

You can feel that everyone does their thing. In China, I think it’s more closed. People will, most people, will do their study work, but here you can feel everyone they may do what they are interested in apart from the work, outside things (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, walking interview).

He thought about how being in campus could develop the people occupying it with the potential for everyone, including non-students, to,

… just feel their atmosphere about university, it’s very good (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, walking interview).

Steve’s perspective about the benefits of an open campus did not change over the course of our conversations over two interviews, even after he experienced a verbal assault on campus by a white, male teenager during our walking interview. The teenager cycled up to Steve and shouted incoherently at him. Steve interpreted the
incident as racially motivated, ‘because of my skin’ and as reflecting the teenager’s lack of social and educational opportunity,

I think if the young people, the people who are racist, if they have the chance to go to an Eastern country, if they experience the phenomenon there, then they can understand why we are like this. Because I have an opportunity to go to a Western country, I can feel the culture here and I can know the way the people think. I can feel the difference in the cultural things and I can understand (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, semi-structured interview).

He associated the ability to traverse boundaries, such as those between campus and city, and those between countries, as widening a person’s conceptual frame, enabling understanding and tolerance. Though the lack of formal boundary controls enabled anyone, including hostile people, to enter campus, Steve felt it was important for campus to be open to others so they could ‘feel’ the university. The openness of campus meant that the university could be shared, and mobility across borders enabled access to others’ cultures, which he saw as assisting in the formation of attitudes such as tolerance and understanding.

Steve located understanding as embodied rather than discursive, something that was felt in the body through encounters with other bodies. He suggested that people could understand other cultures through an embodied experience of being alongside of, and feeling different to, other bodies.

Sarah saw campus as a site for self-individuation, offering academic freedom, intellectual support, a sense of safety and ease which insulated her from anxiety
about her future. The campus permitted her be herself, tying place to values, people, and a way of being in campus.

She singled out a building on campus which contained a church, lecture rooms and performance space.\(^3\)

The fact that a church can be a place where you have classes, that's really interesting. Obviously in Singapore churches don't look like this, sometimes the buildings are on the top floor or stuff like that. So actually seeing a church, being in one, and actually having a lecture in one is really nice (Sarah, Singapore. 4\(^{th}\) year in UK, walking interview).

The building communicated openness and accessibility, unlike churches in Singapore, which she said were housed in non-specific, unrecognisable buildings. Sarah fused an observation about an aspect of the built environment with her imagination to create an idea of existential freedom.

It’s nice to know that sometimes religion and other things can mix. In Singapore it’s quite separate. They don’t talk about religion because it’s sensitive, so you don’t get to know about it much. But having a church here is visually liberating in a weird way, recognising a building has a multiuse is possible, that they can all coexist even though there’s different philosophies. I love it, I think it’s great. That's what it feels like at university sometimes (Sarah, Singapore. 4\(^{th}\) year in UK, walking interview).

---

\(^3\) Here Sarah is describing her phenomenological experience of this building. In fact, lectures are held in the former church hall rather than the church itself, which still functions as a church.
The church building signified plurality of thought and an institutional openness to ‘other things’, different things that could not only ‘coexist’ but ‘mix’. She contrasted this with Singapore, seeing in the building the possibility that ‘sensitive’ things could be talked about. The building conveyed tolerance and permission to think differently which was felt in her body as ‘visually liberating’.

She applied and extended these perceptions to her lecturers,

I think that’s what I like about the University especially, because my lecturers they’re really open to new ideas and stuff, I’ve never mentioned an idea and they say no this is shit, you have to get better. It’s the whole approach that I love about it, which is why I’m still here even though there are other universities to go to (Sarah, Singapore. 4th year in UK, walking interview).

The building evoked feelings which she associated with a pedagogy that was open to different, new ideas which she credited with keeping her at the university.

Sarah applied her feelings about a building to others, fusing perceptions about herself, buildings and others to derive a sense of campus as,

a place where I could be myself without having to stress about life, whether I fit into the mould, whether I’m going to find a job (Sarah, Singapore. 4th year in UK, walking interview).

Being on campus exposed Linda to different forms of university life. She noticed how living arrangements contained embedded social and cultural values such as individualism, community, protection and independence that influenced the behaviour
of those using them and saw her housemates using their freedom to ‘enjoy life’ in the UK whilst seeing the living arrangements in China as offering a form of protection.

She compared her UK campus to China where all undergraduate student accommodation was on campus.

The first thing in my head is the scale. In my university when I did the undergraduate, it was really big, and all the accommodation was in the campus. All the students needed to live in the accommodation. We can’t be away from campus after eleven o’clock at night, we need to be back in campus before that time (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, semi-structured interview).

The spatial design of a Chinese campus incorporated living arrangements for its students, defining their bodily movements in way that aligned study with residence. Though students in China were allowed to leave campus, they had to return to their halls of residence at night. Her Chinese university functioned as home and institution, serving as the centre of academic and non-academic life. The campus design manifested embedded socio-cultural values that Linda framed as institutional care and protection.

Linda contrasted her experience of her Chinese campus with this campus and saw what was missing in terms of accommodation provision and canteens, observing that her Chinese university did not provide cooking facilities.

Here we can choose if we want to live in the campus accommodation or have a house. In the accommodation here, the accommodation doesn’t have a canteen, so we don’t eat together. In my Chinese university we have several
canteens for everyone (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, semi-structured interview).

The configuration of living arrangements transmitted meaning. The provision of canteens ensured that eating was a socially shared practice. Living and eating on campus meant that daily activities occurred inside campus. Linda associated living outside of campus with freedom and self-responsibility and admired the skills this afforded, but as she reflected, she offered a nuanced perspective,

It’s good here, we even try to cook and it surprises me that two of my roommates are undergraduates, and they can also cook. At that age I went to the canteen, it was not safe for us to cook, especially to use fire. In Britain it’s quite a freedom. They have a lot of freedom. Almost every week my roommates will have a party, they will enjoy life. In China the university will control us, will protect us (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, semi-structured interview).

She balanced her admiration for independence against the institutional protection and community extended by the institution towards students in China.

Deborah felt that the design of her office not only failed to meet the bodily needs of students, but also conveyed a lack of consideration of the social potential of academic areas of campus. The spatial arrangements and building design exemplified an institutional lack of consideration, with the result that her physically uncomfortable office was generally empty. The design of the building, whilst ‘nice’, conveyed lack of consideration of students’ bodily and social needs.
Deborah’s office was usually empty, in contrast to her previous office in a different university where,

… everyone like hung out all the time, and we were getting together all the time, it was all very camaraderie (Deborah, USA, 4th year in UK, walking interview).

She was located on a different floor to the supervisory, faculty staff and said that engagement did not happen outside of formally arranged contact. Her fellow PhD students were separated with final year ‘write up’ students being given a separate office making the different groups less socially accessible to each other. Deborah attributed these forms of bodily segregation to a kind of thoughtlessness on the part of the university,

They had to put us somewhere. So we’re here now (Deborah, USA, 4th year in UK, walking interview).

The building arrangements reinforced a spatial stratification, separating students according to stage of study, and all students from staff. Deborah perceived the spatial arrangements as communicating a lack of value of students, as showing an arbitrary thoughtlessness that placed people ‘somewhere’ because they ‘had to’, the word ‘had’ communicating duty rather than desire. Her statement, ‘So we’re here now’, implied a lack of agency or choice over where the institution placed her, with students tending to stay away from the working spaces designated for them. I inquired into this,

Is it always this quiet? (Anne)
Yeah mostly, it’s always a bit stuffy in here too, and the other thing I really hate is there’s no direct windows outside, so indirect, so there’s no airflow through here so sometimes we will unhook the doors just to get a bit of airflow. It’s artistically a nice design but functionally not great (Deborah, USA, 4th year in UK, walking interview).

The arrangements evoked bodily discomfort, separated the bodies of students and staff, and conveyed a lack of priority given to the embodied aspects of students’ social and academic experience, with the result that students tended to stay away from the environment.

1.4 Overcoming barriers

Participants’ use of campus was meaningful and directed. Apart from Deborah, they used parts of campus to resolve issues in response to barriers located in other parts of campus. Participants sought out places that felt accessible and contained familiar aspects and used them to meet a range of needs such as cultural connection, personal support, academic engagement and safety.

The barriers that participants experienced had social impacts. Linda was unable to participate in office social life but found social inclusion through attending concerts. Phil felt excluded from his office social life but felt socially connected to another student in the park. Hannah used the library to find the social contact she lacked in her office and Sarah used green spaces as a respite from social anxiety in other parts of campus. This theme therefore addressed the research question, ‘What are the social dimensions of student’s experience of campus?’.
Linda experienced anxiety about her lack of English language proficiency, frequently referring to this during my interviews with her,

My English or the language gives me a lot of problems (walking interview)

I don't know how to say the English vocabulary (walking interview)

I make a lot of problems about communication (semi-structured interview)

(Linda, China, 1st year in UK,).

She withdrew from office conversations finding herself, as the only international student in her office, unable to keep up with the conversation and unable to benefit from dialogue. As a musician, she attended performances on campus, enjoying being a spectator. The campus arts facilities, including theatre and cinema were practically, economically and emotionally accessible.

Every week we have some performances and concerts, or art talks. It's really nice. My cultural background is totally different. It’s good to understand and engage in your culture. The best way to see another culture is through performance and concerts and for students. It’s free. Wow (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, walking interview).

Whilst Linda was unable to engage discursively with others in her office to enrich her knowledge about art and culture, she was able to use the performance spaces for embodied contact with other people and to gain a visceral feeling of culture. Her prior cultural life acted as a homing device, enabling her to find an area on campus for the intercultural engagement she could not find elsewhere.
In music, Linda found commonality across cultures,

I’m surprised that even though sometimes we have different perceptions, different backgrounds, through art, we are expressing the same thing. I can’t understand when we talk each other about what our understanding is, but through drama or performance, it seems we have the very similar understanding. We have the same understanding of what is good, what is mortal, what is a bad thing. I like classical music; it makes me calm. Yeah, and I don’t know if this word can describe it, splendid. It’s really splendid (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Linda used campus performances to connect with a different culture in a way she could not do in other parts of campus. In music, she found ease and an opportunity to acquire knowledge. Using her experience of similar spaces in China, she found and used a particular performance space on campus to meet her epistemological needs for cultural knowledge, and emotional needs to feel connected and calm. Performances transcended language barriers and were freely accessible. Linda adopted a familiar social practice of attending concerts, using it to achieve what she could not get from her office environment. Performing arts enabled Linda to perceive shared cultural meaning outside of language, offering a form of perceptual or ‘felt learning’ about humanity and culture. This embodied knowledge acquired through sight, sound and feeling, rather than conversation, afforded bodily ease and was ‘splendid’.

Here, Linda described not understanding things discursively but being able to access a form of reciprocal understanding through an embodied, ‘splendid’, feeling, evoked
through accessing the arts alongside others. This non-discursive, felt form of understanding offered her connection to others.

When I asked Linda why she took the photo depicted in Figure 10 she said,

Because theatre is a good way to engage in the culture and the best way to understand is maybe not through reading. The best way to see other cultures is maybe through their kind of performances and concerts (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, semi-structured interview).

I interpreted Linda’s choice of photo as an assertion of value of non-discursive means of understanding in a culture where she frequently felt disadvantaged by her unfamiliarity with the language and prevailing discourses. Taking the photo and talking about it offered her the opportunity to reflect upon ways she could access and participate in this different culture. The photo evoked conversations that articulated her agency and positioned her as proactive in using campus to find spaces of inclusion and connection in an otherwise challenging and lonely environment.
Phil had difficulties with his office and home accommodation. His home felt physically unsafe,

I struggled a lot because wasn’t a good place to stay in. It wasn’t clean, there was leak in the ceiling and the neighbours there weren’t good, specifically during the weekend, partying or noise, and it doesn’t feel safe (Phil, Saudi Arabia, 8th year in UK, walking interview).

and his office felt academically unsafe,

It was quite difficult to concentrate, because when they come, the undergraduate students, they come in groups and they keep talking. Sometimes I had to stop what I’m doing and go for a long break or move to
library to do my work. It’s quite difficult to do anything at the office now (Phil, Saudi Arabia, 8th year in UK, walking interview).

He used a park on campus to manage his academic and domestic stressors, meeting there with a fellow international doctoral student who, due to their shared experience as international doctoral students, understood Phil’s situation. The park represented an open, social environment outside of study and home where Phil could assert his needs in terms of when and how he used it and regulate who was in his vicinity to a greater degree than at his home or office. His office difficulties stemmed from a move to an open plan area in a different building,

Neither his academic home nor his residential home met his needs. Both sets of spatial arrangements seemed more accommodating of others than him, and he felt that he had little influence over either. When stressed, he would meet a fellow international PhD student in a small campus park,

At times like that I used to come here, exactly in this garden here, to relax here. It’s a nice area. I used to come with another international PhD student. We used to come here and sit and talk about issues like about moving to places, or about accommodation, about our studies. We used to come and sit here. It’s safe here (Phil, Saudi Arabia, 8th year in UK, walking interview).

The park was small, often empty and seemed like a place known to few. I sat with Phil in the park for over thirty minutes and we were the only people there. Unlike his office, which was not safe for study, or home, which was not safe for living, the park offered safety, a refuge and a place to connect with someone with shared academic and cultural experience.
Hannah used the library to address social isolation and her blocks to study. She felt lonely in her office and the library contained international students like her who, unlike her colleagues, she perceived as available to her and as offering pleasant social contact, which helped her to reapply herself to her academic challenges. It was a social and academic space, which she used to maximise her academic potential. She felt excluded by her office colleagues who seemed purely focused on academic goals,

Most of the people are busy in their computer. They just come and do their work. They don’t have the time to talk. Their time is very specific for them, so they just want to go to work and finish their work (Hannah, Saudi Arabia, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

She described her office colleagues as being ‘in their computer’, her choice of words conveying a sense of her colleagues as being inside or merged with their equipment, blurring the boundaries between person and machine. I interpreted this as conveying a form of academic immersion that felt excluding. She perceived herself as outside of the ‘specificity’ of her colleagues’ time and the office felt like a site of pressure and focus.

She gravitated towards the library, noticing the architecture, which included a wall sculpture of a person reading,

This is what I feel when I see this. I think a book is the best friend for any person (Hannah, Saudi Arabia, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).
The sculpture comforted her, suggesting the idea of books as friends. Hannah used her photos to highlight aspects of campus that intrigued and supported her such as the flowerbed in Figure 9 discussed above and the wall sculpture in Figure 11.

Oh, this one; I just discovered it this year. I have been walking there for three years and I didn't notice it. I just realised it this year and I like the idea. The person who came with this idea shows you how reading is important for a person's life. The statue gives you the book, you can see the shape of the book and just a few parts of the body. It shows you that the most important thing is reading books. This is what I feel when I see this (Hannah, Saudi Arabia, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Hannah was excited to discover new aspects in her environment and seemed to enjoy sharing her interpretation of the sculpture and speaking about this photo was a prelude (possibly a gateway) for talking about happy experiences in the library.

The welcoming exterior of the library extended inside where she felt empowered to initiate social contact,

I was writing a conference paper. Behind me were some undergraduate students, they were from Egypt, and they made a lot of jokes. When I was writing I started to laugh. These kinds of things, actions, they come to you, you have a break and laugh (Hannah, Saudi Arabia, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

In the library, Hannah felt at ease,
I talked with them and introduced myself. I need these things. Sometimes when I do the work, there is a lot of pressure, a lot of feedback comments and I’m confused. So when I hear jokes or something like that it makes me laugh, so then I can go to my work and think again and reorganise my ideas (Hannah, Saudi Arabia, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Figure 11 – Picture of Hannah’s statue outside the library

Both Phil and Hannah made a point of telling me that their consoling experiences were with fellow international students, with Phil citing their shared experience as inspiring their conversations. It is possible that fellow international students embodied a sense of familiarity which empowered Hannah to feel able to approach the international students in the library for support, in a way that she could not with her British colleagues in her office.

Sarah found the social rules of the office unfathomable and used green spaces to manage her anxiety arising from this. The green spaces evoked both home and the absence of home and were a means of negotiating not being at home. They helped
her to overcome the confusing expectation of the office, soothed her in the absence of friends and offered cultural continuity in the repetition of a familiar bodily practice.

The office is an open space and I sit right by the aisle so people are always walking past. It's challenging for me actually because I never know whether I should speak to them, or how much conversation is too much. So I smile every time they walk past. Sometimes I just avoid the office when I'm not ready to face all these questions on my own (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

She tried to follow unclear social rules by smiling and making conversation but did not know whether this met social expectations. Sometimes the pressure of 'all these questions' became overwhelming. Not knowing the rules governing how her body was supposed to behave evoked stress, forcing her out of the office.

In response she sought out,

...green spots I can escape to. I just like the sound of this place, it's got good sound, like you can hear the traffic, you're not part of the traffic but you are with it. It's like being part of the environment without having to participate in it, that's really nice, I really like that. But obviously you have the greenery, which is very calming for me, so it feels like I'm always separate from all my stress (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, walking interview).

Green spaces on campus provided escape, enabling her to be on campus without feeling overwhelmed. They were a respite from hard to navigate social environments. Locating green spaces was a bodily habit where she transposed her past associations of green into her campus environment,
More green reminds me of when I was a child, my dad would bring me a to a park and we would fly a kite or something, it’s good. We would always search for green spaces, even when we were on holiday or just every day, so even after we have dinner, we always go out to a park. So it’s second nature, I don’t really think about it, it’s not something I do on purpose, I just do it anyway. Even in Singapore when I’m working, I gravitate to green spaces, it’s like a habit, but it’s also an emotional reliance kind of thing (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

She imbued the campus green spaces with the sense of care, engagement and play associated with the memory of her father. This helped her to regulate her anxiety.

…because green spaces, you know to expect, what to do, what’s expected of you. It doesn’t have the same kind of like social pressure that you might have in a cafe, there’s less people around, and even if there are people, people are more respectful, so I don’t have to stress about boundaries, I’m in a contained space but the contained space is more free (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

As well as evoking family and home, and offering a respite from social anxiety about cultural expectations, Sarah used green spaces as a therapeutic space,

This is a just a way for me to negotiate with certain emotions that I might not be able to share with somebody. I think it’s a bit different being here than being back home where I have a bigger support network and more people to talk to. If I have an issue, or some emotions I need to work through, I have friends and family, but over here is a bit different. I need to be able to find
ways to decompress without feeling like I am burdening somebody, and I think these spaces help a lot, with homesickness for example (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview)

– *Pictures of Sarah’s green spaces.*
Sarah’s choice of photos reflected an embodied practice of incorporating green spaces into her daily routine as a form of respite or as a way of incorporating beauty into mundane activities such as working, walking home or going shopping. All six photographs included greenery and sky. Figure 12a depicted her lying on the ground in a small patch of green in the heart of campus.

It’s good because it’s close to all the buildings I need to go. Sometimes when I’m in the library if I want to come out for a bit of a break I’ll come here. It’s nicer than outside the library where it’s all concrete. It’s small. I don’t want to go to a big park and spend too much time, because then I can get lost, enjoy myself way too much and not come back to work when I need to (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).
She made strategic choices about her environment, seeking out green spaces which offered sufficient recreation and sustenance whilst not distracting her from her work and Figure 12a shows her developing spatial practices to sustain her studies.

Access to beauty seemed important to her and when describing Figure 12b she stressed aesthetic aspects using words such as 'pretty', 'lovely', 'nice'.

It is really, really pretty. I like this place, it's the way to Sainsbury’s, the food shop walk. This is lovely, when I have classes I can just come straight out and go into the city centre, it's like a path of nice. It's so pretty, the sunset over in this area can be really nice, and when you catch it right and the trees actually have leaves, they balance it off really well, and it's a really nice place to be, I love it when the summer comes along and the sunsets are just so lovely…

(Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Sarah sought out beauty and incorporated it into her spatial practices, 'the food shop walk' and when talking about Figure 12b, she demonstrated a sustained visual engagement with this part of campus, using her experience of past 'lovely' sunsets to anticipate the future. Figure 12b demonstrates her use of campus to evoke positive feelings to support her wellbeing.

1.5 Being Some Body

Participants were acutely aware of their connection with different international bodies in campus and city, routinely pointing out the nationalities of the people they interacted with. Other international bodies offered a form of identification, security and community in a context where most students were not international. With fellow international students they were permitted to be Some Body, a category which
offered participants a form of ontological security denied them in other encounters, which construed them as ‘not’; ‘no’; ‘any’ or ‘contested’ body (described in the overarching theme of Interrupt). Participants’ bodily identification with other international students yielded friendship and support that was particularly important for Steve following an attack on his body by a local man. Participants spoke of finding social connection with other international students that appeared connected to a perceived sense of welcome from other international bodies, and this sense of welcome meant that social arrangements tended to involve other international students. Other international students embodied familiarity which conveyed acceptance, friendship and support. Therefore, the theme of Some Body whilst answering the research question, ‘What are the social dimensions of student’s experience of campus?’ also responds to the research question, ‘How does campus affect students’ bodies?’ in that it speaks to an identification that is about being an international body.

When Steve and I talked in his office, his supervisor (who Steve made a point of telling me was Korean) introduced herself to me and asked about my research project. Openly greeted by others, Steve seemed part of a community where his body was acknowledged, where he was permitted to be Some Body. The department, occupied by many international bodies, afforded bodily ease and recognition, and my entry was met with curiosity and welcome. The office accommodated diversity, containing examples of coexisting cultural traditions, such as a Christmas tree alongside canisters of Chinese tea. Steve pointed out doctoral researchers from Korea, China and France. Unlike the offices of the other international doctoral
students, where they were in a clear minority, Steve seemed embedded in a multicultural academic environment that received his and others' bodies.

He found similar ease and welcome through a ‘Global Friends' social club for international students where he met his best friend,

The French guy is a very nice guy, he is the best friend I meet in UK because we know each other in ‘Global Friends'. Now we are flatmates. In the first year, he lived alone and then I asked him to live with me, so he moved to my place (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, walking interview).

Steve identified his friend as a 'best friend' because' he was part of a global friendship group, associating being in a 'global' group with friendship. The category of 'international student' encompasses a range of nationalities, but Steve suggested that what the French and Chinese students had in common was a shared embodied experience of being international and therefore of 'being other' in relation to the majority group. Belonging to this category seemed to position him towards others similarly situated regardless of the differences in culture between the different countries.

Whilst returning home at night, Steve was approached by an intoxicated local man and punched in the eye. Steve approached the University student services for help. A fellow PhD student offered to support him when he approached University services for advice and help, and Steve perceived that the student offered to help him, based on the embodied familiarity of them both being Chinese.
One of my Chinese friends, also PhD student, he just helped me because we’re all Chinese here, so we want to give some help. (Steve, China, 2nd Year in UK, semi-structured interview).

In suggesting that the offer of help was made ‘because’ he was Chinese, Steve implied that possibly a non-Chinese person may not have been similarly motivated and pointed to wider implications of embodied similarity and social support.

When Steve spoke to his supervisor about the incident, she drew upon her experience of racism and advised him that the safest response was to ignore it.

I shared my experience with her because she is Korean. She said she also had a similar experience in Glasgow twenty years or thirty years ago. She says you can’t, you have to meet these things, and the best way is that you can’t change their mind. So if they do something rude to you, you just ignore them. It will keep you safe. If you try to fight, because they are local, it will be dangerous (Steve, China, 2nd Year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Steve spoke to his supervisor, ‘because’ she was another international body, implicitly suggesting a significance of bodily identification. His supervisor not only embodied being international but had lived through similar experiences as an international body in the UK, which she used to respond to him. Steve’s supervisor’s advice conveyed helplessness, ‘you can’t change their mind’ and she did not suggest that Steve approach university services or the Police for help, instead locating the response to racial violence as Steve’s responsibility. Her response suggested that keeping Steve’s body safe may require a defensive and self-conscious approach, to avoid bringing attention to his body.
Linda described her social life through the prism of bodily identification,

I have a discussion with another Asian, and in the evening, I may have a good meal with my friends, also from China (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, semi-structured interview).

She did not say that she went out with ‘friends’ for a chat and dinner but affirmed that her social life was with ‘another Asian’ and friends ‘from China’, suggesting an intrinsic significance to shared embodiment. Later she mentioned that her closest (and only) friend in the office was from Cyprus.

Like Linda, Steve noticed other international bodies in his environment.

On Friday, I will go with my Chinese friends to a pub. We will have a drink. There is a very nice pub, it is very quiet and there is live music there. The people there are very nice and they play music. The owners, they are really nice, and he married a German (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, walking interview).

Steve implied that being German was a factor in making both the owners and pub, a ‘nice’ place.

Although Tina did not share the same culture as her Indian friends, the geographical proximity of Sri Lanka and India was important to her, and she derived social benefit from clustering with bodies that were closer to her home country, despite their cultural differences.

Most of them are international students, around four of them are students from India, culture-wise we are different, but we are really close on the map. I am a
Sri Lankan but I’m a part of the Indian culture and society because I have a lot of Indian friends. They made the societies and I’ve been friends with them. I go for all day events despite whether I celebrate or not. So yesterday was really fun, it was nice to see all sorts of people, even white people (Tina, Sri Lanka, 1st year in UK, walking interview).

Tina suggested a tacit, embodied connection to particular others and saw geographic proximity as offering familiarity. Through her friendships with Indian students, Tina identified herself as ‘part of the Indian culture’ on campus and implied that this was due to the access it permitted her to an enjoyable social life. She noticed that ‘even white people’ came to a cultural event on campus, showing awareness of bodies that were different to hers, and assumptions about what those white bodies would do. Her response suggested that she would not normally expect white people to want to be there, possibly implying a sense of white people as not as interested in other cultures as her.

Phil noticed how cultural events seemed to offer an opportunity for different people to socialise together, indicating their potential to generate interest from others, and for connection across cultures.

We have a special month called Ramadan where we fast all day. Two years ago, a society used this area to make a big meal. All the people met here in this area …. they are not from the same culture, even they are not Muslims, but they came just to share the idea, and to understand the idea, it was really good (Phil, Saudi Arabia, 8th year in UK, walking interview).
The cultural events appeared to extend openness and welcome towards different bodies, and Phil and Tina were noticeably pleased at others' interest in aspects of their lives.

Participants appeared to find greater ease with some bodies more than others and experienced an embodied reciprocity with international others. They noticed fellow international students, and felt noticed by them, implying a shared sense of belonging arising from being in a minority.

Extend shows how campus evokes new thinking in participants, inspires imagination, yields insights about culture and shapes attitudes. As they extend into campus, they deploy an embodied form of resourcefulness in using campus space for support in times of unease, which evokes embodied meaning making linking particular spaces with positive aspects such as connection to others, safety and support. In their social lives, they suggest that the shared embodiment of being international experience is significant as it offers welcome and inclusion.

2. Interrupt

Interrupt describes a process where participants’ ease of perception and flow of imagination are stopped. Being interrupted forces participants to encounter, and make sense of, another person’s interpretation of their bodies and exposes them to situations where the particularity of their bodies is unrecognized, unvalued, and discriminated against. Participants seek meaningful relations with other people and desire to be received by them. When this does not happen, participants' capacity to extend in space is stopped, and they become isolated institutionally and socially.
Underlying these institutional and social encounters are different, negative constructions of participants' bodies that deny their particularity. Drawing on the different meanings made of participants' embodied experiences and inspired by Ahmed's conceptualisation of 'being not' (Ahmed, 2007, p.161), I created themes to reflect the different forms of bodily negation experienced by participants.

Any Body denotes how participants' bodies are met with indifference by others, including institutional staff, evoking feeling of powerlessness and discomfort. Others’ responses to their bodies fail to connect their personhood to their situation and ‘disembody’ participants in a way that removes them from the scope of institutional concern.

Not Body depicts the perceived invisibility of participants to others, in contexts where they are the minority ethnic group. They experience themselves as unrecognised, unacknowledged as equals by home students and staff, despite occupying the same offices and spaces on campus. Consequently they move through these spaces as Not Bodies, taking space but not appearing to others.

No Body describes processes where participants perceive an implicit request from British others to erase their experiences of discrimination from official and informal discourse. In these exchanges they perceive pressure to silence themselves and remove their traumatic bodily experiences away from public awareness, becoming No Body, or a non-existent body.

Contested Body describes how participants' bodies are subject to question based on associations with their skin colour. Being a Contested Body attracts others' verbal and physical aggression and disputes participants' entitlement to be in place.
Contested Body assails participants with questions and forces them to justify their presence in place to others, who appear to feel permitted to make decisions about whether participants are the right or wrong bodies in place.

**Interrupt and untaken photos**

The overarching theme of Extend included and discussed 9 photos. There were no photos available for the overarching theme of Interrupt. Participants were not given any directions as to the content of their photos and chose to take photos of positive aspects of campus that were experienced as sites of inclusion where they could enact agency and derive benefit. Interrupt discusses negative aspects of participants' social experience and these aspects appeared to be commemorated in participants' memory and shared through dialogue rather than visually. Interrupt offers a glimpse into 'unseen' aspects of experience, in that it describes implicit and interpreted aspects of experience such as institutional indifference, racism or social exclusion which may not have been easy or safe to represent in images. This validates the importance of gathering data in discursive as well non-discursive methods. The range of data generated reflects these different dimensions of meaning making embodied by the participants.

**2.1 Any Body**

This theme responds to the research question, 'How does campus affect students' bodies?' as it examines the way in which the participants' particular bodily needs for space, tailored advice, and equipment appeared unattended to. As Any Body, participants experienced both institutional and individual indifference. Steve and Phil looked to the university to respond to them following different forms of embodied discomfort. Phil was unable to find a suitable academic space for his academic body
and Steve’s body, experienced as foreign, was subjected to violence (see below). When they approached university services, these services responded by offering advice that conveyed no recognition of the particularity of their embodied distress, advice offered to Any Body that was not perceived useful to ‘their’ bodies. Hannah’s experience of being ‘Any Bodied’ derived from use made of her office equipment, without her knowledge or permission, as if it belonged to Any Body, not to her specific body.

During an office move to a hot-desk environment, Phil lost his allocated desk and was advised that he could share a hot desk with other doctoral students. The hot desk, used by anyone, construed Phil as an Any Body, an arrangement which evoked discomfort, affected his studies and sense of visibility to others.

And when they moved to Z building, I don’t have my own space. There is a hot desk I can use but I don’t have my own space in there. You could come any day, find someone using that desk. It’s an open area, and everyone walks around you, talks, and not only the staff or students, visitors come in. It’s difficult to concentrate or do anything in there (Phil, Saudi Arabia, 8th year in UK, walking interview).

The hot desk available for use by anybody, deprived Phil of a reliable space for ‘his’ body. His requests for his own desk were unsuccessful. Neither the spatial arrangements, nor the departmental administration, seemed to recognise the importance for his bodily comfort and academic progress of having his own desk, forcing him to find a quieter space elsewhere to study.
Finding a space to work outside of his department deprived Phil of access to academic community resources,

It was quite annoying to be honest because I travelled all the way from my country and I am doing my PhD here to network with other professionals, to learn from them, to read their experience, if I have any difficulty I can ask them, so it was quite annoying (Phil, Saudi Arabia, 8th year in UK, walking interview).

The open access arrangements closed Phil’s access to spatial and academic resources and the provision of a desk for Any Body resulted in his withdrawal from his department, simultaneously rendering him No Body in the space, removing him from other bodies and from his professional network. The spatial arrangements available to him challenged his idea of doctoral study, forcing him to reconceptualise it from a collegiate process to an individual one.

Phil sought to resist being Any Body by asking his faculty office to take account of his body but was advised to use the hot desk available for anybody. The university presented the hot desk as the solution to his problem of the hot desk, and then ceased contact with Phil, removing the possibility of a shared solution.

I contacted the school and asked them for a space. They said sorry we don’t have a space. They kept saying that I can use the space in Z building. It’s a hot desk, they said, you can use it. But I was thinking, that’s not the point. They didn’t offer me a desk. They didn’t even reply to me (Phil, Saudi Arabia, 8th year in UK, semi-structured interview).
Faculty office staff appeared to have received Phil’s request as one about facilities rather than Phil’s embodied comfort. In not recognising the embodied aspects of the situation, the practical staff response reduced Phil’s body to an entity, not significantly different to a hot desk, and did not appear to appreciate the importance to Phil of the desk as conferring him a place in an academic community.

Following an attack in the street by a British person, Steve turned to university services for advice and support where, like Phil, he was given ‘general’ advice to ‘claim to another place’.

We went to another place, SU, I don’t know, maybe it’s called ‘Student Advice’? I asked the people there and he said the Policeman can’t, he doesn’t have the power to judge something. If he made a decision at the time and if you don’t agree with him later, you can just claim to another place. I don’t know…. so I just let it pass (Steve, China, 2nd Year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Steve experienced the university advice services as seeming to adopt an unengaged stance towards the attack on his body. Advice services offered him advice about an option to challenge the Police, but the option was not a possibility because it was not offered in a way that was meaningful to Steve. In not being able to comprehend the advice given, Steve was not able to act on it. The advice services both defined and restricted Steve’s capacity for action.

Hannah was allocated her own equipment but found that it was not seen by other students as belonging to her but as belonging to Any Body, arousing anxiety.
Sometimes I came and I found I couldn’t find my chair, it had been replaced with another one, and sometimes I couldn’t find my mouse, or they used my computer and they had done some work there (Hannah, Saudi Arabia, 4th year in UK, walking interview).

To assert her bodily attachment to the objects, she placed a sign on her desk saying, ‘Don’t touch anything on this desk’. The sign was an act of resistance against being Any Body, an assertion of her body and its material entitlements in a space where it seemed unrecognised, and an attempt to establish public recognition of the equipment as a proxy for her particular body.

All three participants experienced themselves as a form of Any Body whereby the particularity of their circumstances (or property) seemed unrecognised by others, who conveyed an indifference towards their circumstances, evoking feelings of discomfort and powerlessness.

2.2 Not Body

As Not Bodies, participants, though present alongside home students, were unacknowledged by them. The nature of participants' presence in spaces with home students was difficult to describe, as words like occupying the space, or inhabiting the space, imply an implicit recognition or acknowledgement of the participants as taking space and living in space with others, which as Not Bodies they were not permitted to do. Instead, their presence as a Not Body rendered them insubstantial, as entities moving through space, but not present to others in space and not given opportunities to form reciprocal human connection with the majority group of home students. This theme shows the invisibility of participants' bodies to home students and therefore
addresses the research question, 'How does campus affect students' bodies?'. This also exposes a social dimension of exclusion which addresses the research question, 'What are the social dimensions of student's experience of campus?'.

Linda did not use her office in the mornings, feeling the need to stay at home to 'remember vocabulary' because she could not participate in her office conversations, due not only to her perceived language ability, but because she was unable to understand the academic cultural content of the conversations. This situation construed Linda as Not Body. She perceived herself as unable to be present in the conversations, unable to access and participate in the cultural, discursive space. This culminated in her withdrawal from the office to learn English vocabulary and western philosophers, so that she could become acknowledged as a body in that space.

Only me is Asian, others speak very fast so it's difficult for me to follow. I study art, the method is different. I need to know western history, western art history, and the philosophy. But you know the philosophy is totally different from my country and some famous philosophers, I don’t know them. My classmates will talk about philosophers and the history of art, but from my cultural background, it's quite difficult to understand (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, walking interview).

Despite being present in body, her presence was not acknowledged, in that it seemed that there were no substantive attempts by her peers to engage her, and that they oriented the pace and topic of their conversation towards other native speakers and western cultural concepts. She implicitly accepted that as a minority, her embodiment of an alternative language and culture was not sufficient to engender
interest or a 'coming towards' her from others, and that she would need to work to reach out to them and to enable her culture to be part of the discourse and herself to become Some Body in the space,

   I think maybe if I can speak fluent English then I can introduce more from my culture background, the aesthetic culture, and the philosophy (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, semi-structured interview).

When I met with Linda, she thanked me for being interested in her,

   Your research is good for us, for international students. It seems the international PhD candidate is quite a minimum number. As far as I know, in our department, not including EU students, only me this year is international. I’m so glad you’re interested in our life. I pray for that kind of interview (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, semi-structured interview).

She was grateful and expressed a longing, ‘I pray’, for this form of contact with others. She seemed to imply that the interest towards her would only come from other international PhD students. Implicit in her narrative was an expectation of little social contact from British students, making her feel ‘alien’. As the only Asian in her vicinity, Linda did not perceive herself as a figure of interest to non-Asian others, seeing her difference as a form of social division.

   The first week I’m here I really was shocked, in class I’m the only Asian and I go to our office and I’m the only international, and in my house, it is only me, not British. I’m totally in the British culture. It’s quite a shock, especially for international students, sometimes we need to talk to other people. We don’t
want to be alien. It has been sometimes a little bit lonely (Linda, China, 1st year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Phil and Steve both felt unacknowledged by home students. Both sought to understand home students’ lack of communication by thinking of how the world might appear to home students, extending their awareness of how home students’ circumstances may mitigate against engagement with them.

Phil felt excluded by home students, who he thought had a lack of curiosity towards international students. He perceived that he was unacknowledged by others in the office, which rendered him simultaneously in view as an occupier of the space, and out of view as someone to communicate with. He perceived himself as available and open to meaningful encounter but felt undesired. He was proximal to the potential of an encounter, but proximity did not put the encounter in his reach and the subsequent absence of encounter left him feeling overlooked and receded from by home students. When summarising his experience of his time on Port campus, he used the word ‘alone’ frequently.

I noticed that engaging with other international students is much easier than engaging with British students. Maybe because they are busy, some of them they do basically full-time PhD and part-time teaching, this might be the reason. But if we are working in the same area, sometimes they don’t even say anything like hi or hello, nothing at all. I think even in British culture it’s okay to say, hi, hello and good morning. This is just about saying hi and hello, things simple like this. Sometimes I don’t even know how they’re doing, or what are they teaching, nothing at all because I don’t see any kind of
communication with them. It’s much easier to communicate with other international students.

Is it that the home students don’t seem to be available for conversation, or they don’t seem to want to converse? (Anne)

I feel it’s like they don’t want to (Phil, Saudi Arabia, 8th year in UK, walking interview).

Phil used his perspective on the world to try to experience the world from the home students' perspective, as a way of understanding why they might not be communicating with him, and he interpreted home doctoral students as too preoccupied with their own concerns to acknowledge him. The lack of contact with home students meant that he felt isolated from them.

Steve suggested that home students already had a social network, and therefore did not need or want more friends. He felt that having a shared language enabled home students to communicate easily with each other and form their ‘own group’ which seemed to preclude friendships with ‘foreigners’. He perceived home students as directed towards what felt familiar through shared language and existing friendships and considered that they had no need to reach beyond these. This left him with unrequited desire and little sense of how to address this. Implicit in his narrative was a perception of home students as lacking a wish to engage beyond what was culturally familiar, and that international students' shared cultural unfamiliarity with the UK provided a basis for the formation of bonds across international students.

We want to know some British guys, we want to know the culture here.
Do you know any British guys? (Anne)

Not really.

Why do you think that is? (Anne)

There are some reasons; one is that because I do research work, I just work in an office and all the other colleagues around me are foreigners, and the other reason is that, maybe British students they have their own group, so their own English is really good and they have a friend before, and that’s why.

So they don’t make friends? (Anne)

Friends with foreigners I mean, yeah.

How do you feel about that? (Anne)

It’s not very good but I can understand that because when I was in China, as a Chinese, I have my own Chinese friends. We play together because we have similar viewpoints about the world, and we can play the things all we like. So as a foreigner I think it’s easier to make friends with foreigners because we are all new here, we don’t know the environment here so it’s easier for us to make friends (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, walking interview).

Steve saw British students socialising with other British students, and applied this to his own experience in China, equating being in his home country with being alongside others who held similar ‘viewpoints about the world’. He then made sense of his identity as Chinese in relation to other Chinese people when in China and used this to think about how the embodied similarity of being international made the
formation of friendships with similar international others easier, due to a shared understanding of the experience of being outside of their home country.

2.3 No Body

In their encounters with British bodies, Steve and Sarah were encouraged to diminish or play down their distressing experiences to privilege the comfort of British bodies. In their exchanges with the Police (Steve) and with white friends (Sarah) they perceived a suggestion to silence themselves by not reporting or talking about experiences of discrimination, a request to erase their experiences, to become No Body. In a slightly different form of No Body process, Tina and James enacted self-erasure in their conceptualisation of their value to Port University. They longed for more international bodies on campus, particularly Tina, who wanted more similar bodies like hers to create a larger community, but unable to conceive of their bodies as having intrinsic value or interest to the university, they framed the importance of their bodies in terms of money and enhanced reputation. As such, they erased their particular qualities from their discourse about the value of international students. These varied meanings convey or infer a possible political dimension to the participants' experience of campus and respond to the research question, 'What are the political dimensions of students' experience of campus?'. Participants interpreted British others as unable to respond to their experiences of discrimination (Steve and Sarah) and interpreted their value to universities as economic or reputational (Tina and James). Threaded through these accounts is a sense of participants as having less power in relation to British others and of their needing to adjust to others' expectations of them as international people.
Steve was punched in the eye by a man in a street adjacent to campus. Shortly after, a Police Officer approached him, asked him to ‘forgive’ his attacker and to agree not to report the incident. These requests sought to ensure that there was no official record of the violence towards Steve. Steve was asked by the police officer to become No Body, someone who had not existed in the space. Although grateful for the Police Officer’s presence in limiting the violence done to him, Steve interpreted the Police Officer’s actions as intended to privilege protecting a British male from potential injury (loss of career and criminal record) above attending to a physically assaulted foreign person.

It’s a British man, I think he’s very young. He just shouted at my ear from close by. He shouted at me, very loud. I was scared and I said, ‘What’, and it seems he’s drunk, and then he punched me, just here. Luckily at the time a Policeman came, appeared, and I think they saved me, because I don’t know what to do. At the time he punched me in my eye, it really hurt, I just, at the time, I’m blind you know, I don’t know if my eye works or not and then the Policeman comes (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, semi-structured interview).

The Police Officer persuaded Steve not to report the incident.

The policeman said there are two ways to solve the problem. One is that it’s a crime, it is only a crime. I don’t know about the law in England. He said because there are no records in the police, and he never did do something wrong before. If I can forgive him, if he has a chance to be forgiven, next time if he punches others, he will be in prison or something somewhere else, I don’t know. Another way is I don’t forgive him, and he may be ordered to do the
labour work or something. I don’t know. (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, semi-structured interview).

The Police Officer asked Steve ‘to turn a blind eye’ to the violence perpetrated on his body, to render it invisible to official record, as if it never happened. Steve made his decision by trying to perceive the perpetrator’s circumstances, using his awareness of the impacts of alcohol on his own body to understand the perpetrator’s situation of being drunk.

He said he will lose his job, and the Policeman asked me would I choose, and I think at the time I don’t want him to lose his job because I know he’s drunk, really drunk. Yeah if I were drunk and if someone hurt me. I don’t know, I can’t remember, and I can’t control myself. I said I don’t want him to lose his job and he said he can pay me for the glasses, because my glasses were broken (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Steve reflected,

In my mind, I think the Policeman wanted to protect the British people (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Steve understood the social environment as requiring certain actions from his body and interpreted this requirement to mean that as an international person, protecting his body was of less priority to powerful others.

Sarah had frequent encounters with people who made meaning of her different body in ways that she experienced as aggressive, and distressing. When she tried to talk about these distressing encounters with white people, she felt silenced and found
that they receded from hearing her accounts, making her feel guilty for ‘burdening’ them.

When someone’s really racist at me, it’s difficult because the people I know here, they are Caucasian, so at first when I shared this experience with them, they were feeling like I’m targeting them, if you know what I mean? (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

She then connected her own embodied experience of helplessness with others bodily feelings and sought to protect them from feeling it.

I do feel like sometimes if I wanted to share my emotions, or talk about some experiences, it might be emotionally burdening on somebody … I don’t want to create a situation where they don’t know what to do with themselves, helplessness is not something that I enjoy, I don’t want to put it on someone else (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Sarah interpreted other people as unable to connect the racism she experienced with her body. Instead, they appeared to associate hearing about racism, directed towards Sarah’s body, as an attack on their bodies, and seemed unable to draw on a sense of shared embodiment with Sarah to perceive the effects of racism on her particular body. In contrast, Sarah identified her feelings of helplessness and used them to think about others’ feeling worlds. This ability to identify herself in others evoked a wish to care for them. She perceived that the people she spoke to about experiences of racism perceptually receded from recognising the violence on her. In response she sought to maintain an intersubjective connection with them by using her bodily
subjectivity to connect with feelings in them that she recognised from her own experience.

Whilst acknowledging the embodied impacts of racism on her body as hurtful and ‘unfair’, Sarah suggested that others' behaviour might reflect their general ignorance, rather than their opinions about her as an individual. However, the complexity of combining understanding with personal feelings of hurt later yielded a more conflicted sense of connection where she expressed the tensions of balancing forgiveness with anger.

It feels unfair. Sometimes, I get really hurt. I don’t think a lot of them are racist on purpose. They might not know they’re being racist. I try to keep that in mind. They’re not doing this because they think you’re a terrible person, they just don’t know. I don’t know. It’s so hard. I’m always forgiving. I'm just like, you’re such an arsehole (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Tina and James wanted to see more international bodies on campus and were keen to assert the value of their bodies to the institution, possibly suggesting a latent sense of not feeling intrinsically valued. Both framed their bodies as sources of income and untapped political power, and whilst these interpretations placed a particular value on international students' bodies, none of the international doctoral student participants spoke about the university as desiring them as individuals.

Tina became a student ambassador, a role that gave her the opportunity, through leading campus tours, to use her Sri Lankan body to grow the numbers of Sri Lankan students. Feeling that the low numbers of Sri Lankan students in the university
deterred others from coming, she used her ambassador role to facilitate an embodied dialogue between herself and them.

I do campus tours. I know all the buildings. I really like that role because you’re representing the University. It’s like you are proud to be a part of this institution, and then you’re given this opportunity to present it to another person. If students know, especially students from Sri Lanka, that there are more Sri Lankans in the campus they would be more willing to come because they would have a community here. It would be beneficial for the University because the international students pay a lot of money as fees, the profit generation would come from the international students because they would be paying like twice the amount as home students or an EU student would be paying (Tina, Sri Lanka, 1st year in UK, walking interview).

Tina felt that more Sri Lankans on campus would create greater community. She wanted more bodies like hers on campus to engender relationships but suggested that bodies like hers were only valuable to the university through their fee income.

James felt that there were too few international students on campus, seeing their value to the institution in terms of higher academic standards and increased ranking. He felt that not recruiting international students risked the reputation of the university.

I would like to increase the number of international students. If the university has not a lot of students from other parts of the world, it’s lower down. If you don’t make your university international then you degrade at what yours, and that’s how it is … if you want to compete international-wise I think integrating,
those different minds, by inviting bright people here you raise the university
standard (James, Tanzania, 4th year in UK, walking interview).

Tina and James conceived their significance to the University in terms of the
monetary value of their bodies and the university’s international status. Outside of the
financial and reputational aspects, neither perceived themselves as mattering for
what they could offer socially, culturally or humanely, rendering them a form of No
Body.

The process of becoming No Body suggests either that the particularity of
participants’ experiences are not perceived to be as valuable as British people’s
(Steve and Sarah), or that participants do not perceive their institutional value as
other than financial or reputational (Tina and James). This culminates in an erasure
of their experience, where they do not receive concern for their wellbeing, or perceive
recognition of their particular contribution.

2.4 Contested Body

Steve and Sarah experienced aggression directed towards their bodies. Their
entitlement to be in place was questioned by others who construed their existence
here as a matter for dispute. They were positioned as Contested Body, a body
vulnerable to multiple, questionable meanings made of them, based on skin colour
and exposed them to a sense of their bodies as political matter available for others’
construction of their entitlement to be in place. This theme responds to the research
question ‘What are the political dimensions of students’ experience of campus?’. As a
Contested Body, they were seen as public property, as subject to question, and as
available to receive others' erroneous assertions about them. These assertions
conveyed aggression and exclusion. This interrupted their flow of experience, requiring them to make an adjustment to a different bodily relationship with the environment, one where they perceived themselves as objectified, as seen through another’s perceptual filter. Inhabitation of place then involved a form of double self-consciousness, consciousness of self through the eyes of oneself and consciousness of oneself through the eyes of another. The racial encounters involved a violation of the students' bodily or perceptual boundaries, and of their ontological integrity as equals in a shared world. Their experiences showed how an unselfconscious, easy integration of body and world becomes a question of privilege conferred to some bodies and not others.

Sarah had a paid job in the student union (a student-only employer) as a cleaner, and whilst cleaning was often asked by other students if she could speak English. The question detached Sarah from the space, made her stand out and shaped the space around her into one where her status was questionable. Though it appeared polite, the question exposed an asymmetry of power and required Sarah to justify her presence in the space.

I can understand English don’t panic, it’s fine, I know I’m a cleaner who’s Asian but it’s doesn’t mean I can’t speak English (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, semi-structured interview).

This experience had embodied and spatial impacts. The student union became stressful and uncomfortable to occupy where Sarah felt self-conscious of her different body, feeling judged by others, even when using it outside of work as a student.
This student union doesn’t become like a relaxing place. It becomes stressful because it’s where my job is. Even if I did wander through to take a break, or go there to have lunch, it would be really awkward. It becomes like a form of judging instead. I appreciate it may not be that way, but in my head, it feels like that.

What? Kind of looking at you? (Anne)

Yeah (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, walking interview).

Sarah’s experience of being questioned in the student union turned the space into one of tension and restricted her ability to occupy it outside of work. Being in the space made her body feel ‘awkward’ and she perceived herself as judged by others. Her experience illustrated the lingering effects of racism on the body and its capacity to restrict the experience of space, in contrast to those who could occupy it freely, without anxiety and without the self-consciousness of feeling like a Contested Body. Being questioned in space interrupted her embodied flow and rendered her body a site of judgement for and by others, meaning that inhabiting the space involved a sense of double consciousness, consciousness of self as she appeared to herself, and consciousness of herself as she appeared to others.

This process was also enacted in Port City where Sarah’s existence was questioned, exposing multiple meanings made of her body, including being an ‘import bride’ and a thief of British people’s jobs. Her existence in the space was commodified, and she was denoted as a sexual entity brought in by, and for, a white man. The word ‘import’ denoted non-belonging and a lack of autonomy, imposed a notion of her, on her, that
was not her and redefined her into something that felt negating and unrecognisable. The words ‘import bride’ placed and displaced her.

Sometimes because my partner’s white, we do get people asking us are you an import bride (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, walking interview).

This happened on several occasions in the city, indicating public interpretations made of female, Asian bodies, and others’ sense of entitlement to question her body’s status in the place. The meaning made of Sarah was not of her volition, constructed her body as a collectively definable entity, and made the space uncomfortable to occupy.

Sarah was also constructed as a thief, as taking something that wasn’t hers. In response she justified herself, arguing that she was taking a job that no-one wanted, therefore implicitly showing how these constructs had entered her sense of self-in-the-world and occupied her thinking space, becoming something to be engaged with and negotiated. Perceived as a problem to the economy, she found herself defending her right to be in the space and reassuring herself that she was not taking something that someone else wanted.

I’m just used to it because people say weird things to me on buses as well. They say things like, ah you steal our jobs and stuff, but they don’t understand. The thing is I work as a cleaner and no-one wants to apply for the job, we have a huge problem actually staffing-wise, so I don’t really know (Sarah, Singapore, 4th year in UK, walking interview).

In campus and city Sarah was forced to take account of the multiple meanings made of her body. Her body in the space was seen as a body in question forcing her to
think of the multiple ways her habitation in place could be constructed, exposing her to different forms of Contested Body.

This double consciousness (consciousness of self and consciousness of self as seen by others) meant that Sarah and Steve’s bodily ease of movement in place was interrupted. As Sarah was forced to account multiple perceptions of her body in place, Steve similarly encountered hostile meanings made of his body.

Whist walking with me on campus, a teenage boy cycled up to him, shouted something loud and incomprehensible in his face and cycled away. Initially Steve conceptualised the experience as the boy having a joke with him, then he reflected that there may have been a political element to it and finally he suggested a racial aspect.

Maybe he just wanted to have fun with me, he’s kidding I mean. Because maybe I’m a foreigner. I don’t like this, I haven’t got used to it yet, I mean most British people are very kind and friendly. Some of them may not be. Maybe they are not that warm-hearted? I don’t know. Maybe they have views about China, about politics about China? I don’t know. I’m not comfortable (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, walking interview).

The encounter forced him to consider the multiple ways he could be perceived by another person as: a joke, a political entity, and a racial entity and presented him with the confusing range of negative meanings made by others about his body. As a white woman walking with Steve on Port Campus, I was not shouted at, and had never experienced this kind of interrupted passage on campus. Being alongside Steve gave me a visceral and vicarious sense of how bodily ease of passage in a seemingly
inclusive space can be disrupted and how being-in-place can become insecure and a question of entitlement.

Steve equated being a ‘foreigner’ with susceptibility for being singled out in the environment and told me about experiences of being punched in the street (see above) and racially abused in a burger bar.

We just buy some burger, and there are some English people there and the man cooked the burger for us and gave the burger to us. Then a man just said, ‘Why do you give the burger to Chink before us?’ So because I have an experience before, when I’ve been punched. Then I just thought they’re drunk, so after taking the burgers we just came back home (Steve, China, 2nd year in UK, semi-structured interview).

This incident triggered memories of past experiences of racial violence towards his body which shaped his response as he perceived a threat of violence. In the burger bar, Steve was constructed as having disrupted a social order prioritising English people, ‘us’ above foreign others, a social order and climate that permitted a British male to assert this. The violence of the encounter restricted Steve’s ability to remain in the bar and he described evacuating the space for bodily safety.

Steve’s experience as a ‘different face’ had inspired attack, leaving him feeling helpless and seeing violence towards different bodies as inevitable. The legacy of the differing forms of violent encounter experienced by Steve: a physical assault in the city, a verbal assault on campus and a racial slur directed at him in a burger bar, was seen in his descriptions of the effects,
I think it’s very normal because I always meet with things like that, so it
sometimes makes me very helpless. I just can’t understand it

Is the experience on your mind? Or does it pass through your mind? (Anne)

I think no, no. Maybe I will feel this experience. When I come back to it 20
years later, so maybe I will feel this experience, I think it will be in my mind. I
can forget the behaviour but this experience I will remember, I think (Steve,
China, 2nd year in UK, semi-structured interview).

Steve described the emotional impact of helplessness and sense of the inevitability,
‘normal’, ‘always meet’, of violence towards him. He suggested that whilst he might
be able to ‘forget’ what others did to him, he would remember what it felt like,
perceiving that that the experience might linger in his body, that he might, still, ‘feel
this experience’ in 20 years' time.

By questioning Sarah’s ability to speak English, constructing her as an import bride
and taker of jobs, and by physically and verbally attacking Steve, other people used
terms and behaviours that depersonalised and defined Steve and Sarah as being
outside of the social setting. The meanings made of them, based on their bodies,
‘othered’ them, forcing them to think about perceptions of themselves that were
unfamiliar and incomprehensible (both repeatedly used the phrase, ‘I don’t know’
when talking about these incidents).

These encounters obscured the particularity of students' bodies, singled them out
within the social context and interrupted their meaning flow, forcing them to listen to,
and take in, another’s, non-negotiated, meaning making of them. The social context
within which the incidents occurred seemed to support embedded, asymmetrical power relations that appeared to permit others to enact racism towards the students.

**Summary**

Extend and Interrupt are contrasting experiences, of being permitted to develop new insight through engagement with the materiality of campus, and of not being permitted to move with ease in their encounters with others. In Extend, participants experienced bodily ease and were able to make individual and personal meaning of themselves and their lives in campus. In Interrupt, participants experienced the bodily discomfort of being forced to take account of others' meaning making of them in the city and campus.

This chapter has demonstrated how the materiality of campus evoked sensual bodily responses which participants used to understand themselves in campus, to contrast with their cultural frame of reference, and to reflect upon the embodied impacts of being in a different culture. The built environment inspired imagination and evoked metaphor, which they used to express their existential awareness of self-in-campus. Being in campus suggested particular and different cultural values such as freedom of thought and freedom of movement, which participants interpreted and applied to their lives at Port University, reflecting on the benefits of a new and different cultural perspective. Participants were resourceful in using campus to support themselves at times when being on campus was stressful: they found places that were intelligible to them, places that offered aspects of familiarity and were a touchstone of comfort.

Participants experienced different forms of bodily negation where their particularity seemed obscured and unseen, both on campus and in the city. This was exemplified
in offices that were hard for their bodies to inhabit, due to not being able to participate discursively, not knowing the ‘rules’, not having the security of a space to study and insecurity about equipment. Their bodies experienced verbal and physical assault on account of being different bodies, and they experienced feelings of exclusion and isolation from home students. Institutions such as university services and the Police appeared not to have been able to 'see' the particularity of the students' situations, or to prioritise the bodily impacts of what had happened to them. Despite these experiences of negation, participants sought to understand and extend a sense of humanity towards others, including home students. Throughout this chapter I have shown how the themes connected with and responded to the research questions.
Chapter 5 - Discussion

Introduction

This chapter returns to the research sub-questions with discussion focused on how themes connect and respond to them. Chapter 4 (Figure 4) showed how themes linked to the research sub-questions and this section will follow this structure. Finally, the discussion highlights where multiple themes intersect to respond to the main research question. The research's possible contribution to knowledge is summarised under each research question.

Research sub-question 1: How does campus affect students' bodies?

This question is addressed through the following themes:

1.5 Being Some Body

2.1 Any Body

2.2 Not Body

These themes emphasise embodied aspects of participants' experience of campus and help theorise processes that are taking place. Merleau-Ponty's (2012) notions of the body schema and of intersubjective relationship give ways to begin to make sense of the embodied aspects of participants' engagement with both the institution and with others. I draw on Merleau-Ponty's (2012) thinking about intersubjectivity to
derive new theoretical thinking about the importance of what I term embodied particularity and embodied familiarity.

1.5 Being Some Body

This section discusses the links between Being Some Bodies and experiences where participants were not permitted to be Some Bodies. I use the contrast to show the importance of what I term 'embodied particularity' and 'embodied familiarity', and the consequences when these are not present. Being Some Body refers to the ways that participants make engaged social connections with other international students, experiencing reciprocity with those who, despite many differences, share the similarity of not being home students. It forms part of the overarching theme of Extend as it is a way that participants are permitted to make social connections. However, being Some Body happens within a wider context of bodily negation and failed reciprocity. Merleau-Ponty's (2012) discussion of dialogue and intersubjectivity gives a way to start working out these ideas, particularly in his suggestion that reciprocity in relationship relies on our seeing others as subjects, as they simultaneously regard us as subjects also. This experience of intersubjective sharing appears to be present in Steve's perception of his supervisor's embodied experience of being other, chiming with his own similar experience, enabling him to feel a symmetry of understanding based on embodied familiarity. He perceived her as reflecting a lived, shared understanding of being a minority ethnic body. This enabled him to feel what seems to have been a pre-reflective recognition of shared experience, an understanding by another of his experience of his bodily presence being challenged and attacked in Port City. The acknowledgement of this shared bodily experience by his tutor, and her subsequent advice about how to manage such
situations, seemed to have a resonance and meaning for Steve, which appeared not to be the case in his dealings with university services. The shared embodied experience resulted in Steve feeling recognised and acknowledged in a way that appeared intersubjective, and reciprocal. He felt supported and cared for and experienced the advice offered to him as intelligible, as something that he could act on. The action he was advised to undertake was not to insist on his bodily particularity being recognised in this environment, for fear of contestation or attack that he did not have the power to prevent.

Tina’s sense of embodied familiarity with other Indian students, based on geographic proximity, offered a social affinity that produced satisfying friendships. She saw the Indian students as embodying sufficient familiarity to connote friendship and connection and described this as being evident in actions - celebrating, cooking, organising events together. This evokes Arendt’s (1958) argument that we need to ‘see’ others and be ‘seen’ by them for social engagement and learning to take place. Steve and Tina felt ‘seen’ by other international staff and students. I suggest that being international offered a reciprocity of connection which did not appear to happen with home students, who were not perceived as available for friendship or dialogue. Participants became Some Bodies for each other, people, or subjects in relationship. Participants seemed drawn to engagement with other international people, as in these encounters their bodily particularity was recognised, and they shared the bodily familiarity of being international. Relationships with other international students seemed to offer intersubjective relating, care and engagement which engendered a degree of bodily ease absent in some settings with home students. I note, therefore, that the metaphor of ‘appearing to others’ used by Arendt (1958, p. 199) does not
fully convey the range of what occurs in such intersubjective encounters. As Steve and Tina illustrate, it is in the bodily encounter, in the pre-reflective embodied experience of familiarity between ourselves and others, and of their recognition of our embodied particularity, that we appear to others, as they appear to us. This is a more physical, pre-reflective and less cognate process than metaphors of sight or perception imply.

These ideas of pre-reflective bodily encounters, apprehending and managing the world through action which may be prior to, or underlie cognition, fit well with Merleau-Ponty’s (2012) description of the body schema. Participants seek reciprocal engagement with others, and in experiencing embodied familiarity and recognition of their embodied particularity with other international students, they experience a kind of bodily orientation towards each other. This aligns with the notion that intelligibility involves a pre-reflective recognition and capacity for action: Steve does not indicate that the response of the university services was cognitively incoherent, but he seemed not to be able to use it in the way he could use his supervisor’s response. Rather than this being a difficulty of thinking, it seems that Steve had an embodied recognition of what she said to him, he could accommodate it in the frame of his body schema, in a way that was not available to him with the university services.

Participants described feeling unacknowledged by home students, despite sharing the campus with its cafes, leisure and sporting facilities, shops and open-access spaces. Linda and Phil felt excluded from their office social life where home students formed the majority and Steve perceived home students as having no incentive to form friendships with international students. Participants wish to be part of a shared social world with home students, as well as with other international students, but this
sense of being unacknowledged led to feelings of discomfort and the perception of an implicit socio-spatial restriction to the possibility of reciprocal, intersubjective, relationship with home students. This orientates them towards other international students and away from home students leaving them with regret at restricted relational possibilities.

Taking up the socio-spatial position of Some Bodies, forming relationships and occupying social, material space, largely with each other, involves distinct processes of bodily orientation and restricted relational possibility. Participants experience a bodily orientation towards relationships that involve embodied familiarity and recognition of embodied particularity which happens with each other, and they experience a restriction of intersubjective relating with home students as a result of lack of engagement from them. This lack of reciprocity forms a social restriction which shapes the socio-material space available for participants to occupy and aligns with Arendt’s (1973) thinking about the ways that majority groups delineate the space and identities available for minority groups. Participants perceived themselves as outside of social life with home students and by not being able to create social relationships with home students, centred their social life in the company of other international students, across many and various nationalities and cultures. I suggest therefore that the term ‘international student’ is not just a factual description of a particular cohort of the student body. It is also a social identity, delineated for these students in their experience of day to day living, by the responses they receive from their environment, which makes them ‘other’.

Being an international student seemed unifying, figural and salient in their sense of identity overseas, transcending differences in culture, ethnicity and language, and
pointing to a shared subjectivity and shared capacity to conceive of each other as subjects in a shared world. This perceived reciprocity produced friendships between Chinese and French students, Chinese and Greek students and Sri Lankan and Indian students, although the differences in culture and experience involved in these relationships are not obviously greater than those between, for example, UK and Chinese students. Participants seemed to suggest that a shared sense of being international offered the prospect of reciprocity and the prospect of being ‘met ’ humanely by others.

This mirrors the widespread, and international, research indicating lack of social relationships between home and international students (Brown, 2009; Herman and Meki Kombe 2019; McMahon, 2018); Pham and Tran, 2015). It was a disappointment to them, mirroring also Tsouroufli`s (2015) and Arday`s (2017) earlier findings with UK international doctoral students.

The Researcher as Some Body.

My interest in participants' experiences resulted in of a kind of bodily orientation towards them. I wanted to be alongside them, was receptive to their experience and able to communicate this to them on our walks and during our interviews. I suggest that this conveyed a sense that I recognised and valued the particularity of their experience which may have conveyed a sufficient sense of bodily familiarity to engender openness with me. Linda said that she had 'prayed' for the type of interest I had shown in her to be shown towards her from others in her environment. She mentioned how lonely it had been being the only Asian in her department and accommodation, which made her feel like an 'alien'. I suggest that my recognition of participants' particularity engendered a form of embodied familiarity through our
shared interest in their lives. When this happened, participants felt ‘seen’ and acquired agency and authority, which they demonstrated in the walking interviews where they decided where to walk, what to show me, and what meanings they wanted to explore with me. It also suggests that a bodily orientation towards engaging with another person is a minimum requirement and prerequisite for intersubjective reciprocity.

2.1 Any Body and 2.2 Not Body

The overarching theme of interrupt contains the themes of 2.1 Any Body and 2.2 No Body which describe how participants accommodated to meanings that were made of their bodies’ presence, in the university and city which impacted the range and nature of spaces they could occupy, involving troubled, and troubling, experiences of place. These evoked Bengsten and Barnett’s (2017, p. 116) ‘dark spots and blind angles’.

This section considers how Merleau-Ponty’s (2012) and Arendt’s (1973, 1958) thinking about intersubjectivity can be applied to participants' bodily experience of becoming Not and Any Bodies, leading to discussion of their agency to respond.

The category of Any Body describes ways participants were met with indifference by others, socially and by institutional staff. In these situations, others did not connect with participants' bodily particularity, did not recognise their personhood, and approached them as if they were Any Body. The category of Not Body refers to occasions where participants experienced themselves as unrecognised and unacknowledged by home students and staff, becoming Not Bodies, taking space, but not appearing to others, not even achieving a status as Any Body.
Any Body

In becoming Any Body, participants experienced bodily discomforts. Hannah felt anxiety when her equipment was taken and used without her permission, Phil was anxious and angry at not being provided with a designated desk and Steve, unable to comprehend the advice given from the student advice teams after being attacked, ‘let it pass’. Steve and Phil’s experiences raise concerns about the levels of cultural competency (Student Minds, 2022) within institutional services staff, and highlights the importance of university staff being able to understand the complexities and concerns affecting international minority ethnic students, such as racism, discrimination and other forms of minority stress like academic acculturation. The advice given by university staff appeared to show a lack of awareness of bodies, of the bodily discomfort of having to work in an open plan office with no designated desk, and the bodily discomfort of being punched in the eye. The advice given to Steve and Phil appeared ‘disembodied’. Steve was not signposted towards medical or wellbeing services and both Phil and Steve were given procedural advice which did not acknowledge the impact of ‘spatio-corporeal relations’ (Hopwood and Paulson, 2012, p. 674) on their (well)being-in-the-world.

A desk and computer equipment can be seen as cultural objects, which, being manmade, convey, ‘an atmosphere of humanity ’(Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p. 347), and an impression of other people. These objects represented varied interpretations of institutional humanity, for example, computer equipment that signified care and humanity to Linda, evoked anxiety in Hannah. A desk, presented as an opportunity by a university office, was experienced as a restriction of opportunity by Phil. Phil and Hannah attempted to convey something about their experience of these objects to
others, but felt their concerns were not acknowledged. Similarly, Steve, whilst perceiving an intention to help, was unable to comprehend or use the given by the student advice centre, suggesting an institutional failure to appreciate the traumatic, embodied nature of the violence (and subsequent cover up of that violence) against him. Steve was advised to seek support outside of the university. As discussed, Steve was able to appreciate and understand his supervisor’s advice, perhaps due to his experience of reciprocal bodily familiarity with her. This may suggest that there could be some benefit in ensuring that institutional services are staffed with a range of people from different countries offering a wider range of lived experience and with staff who have an understanding of racism and its impacts.

In addition to a bodily directedness towards reciprocal, intersubjective relationship with others, participants are directed towards reciprocal engagement with the institution. Hannah and Phil wanted to be provided with the material, social and relational resources to facilitate their studies, and Steve turned to the university for support and guidance following an incident in which he was harmed and unsure how to respond. Their ‘reaching towards’ the institution was met with a response that did not acknowledge the embodied nature of their discomfort, and their requests were not responded to in ways that were intelligible. For Phil the university’s solution to problems with a hot desk was to offer a hot desk, for Hannah signs asking for property to be left alone had no impact on others’ use of her property, and for Steve physical harm appeared not to be acknowledged in an intelligible way. These patterns of response, while acknowledging the presence of participants, did not acknowledge their particularity, their embodied subjectivities, and they experienced themselves as being responded to in general or procedural terms, as Any Body.
Hannah and Phil seemed to have a similar experience of disruption to their body schema as Steve. Phil spoke of his distress about the responses to him from the institution. He was confused by the university’s reactions to his request and experienced little sense of reciprocity or ‘gearing in’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012) to his embodied needs. He found it impossible to navigate the situation and felt forced to find his own space outside of that designated to him. This required a re-organization of his body schema (Merleau-Ponty, 2012), a moderation to his embodied orientation towards the university by going outside of the communication channels (and outside of relationship with his school office) to locate a desk elsewhere. This evoked anxiety, as he perceived himself as not having the permission to use this space, but he persisted with this solution as it afforded him sufficient bodily comfort to complete his studies. Similarly, Hannah described feelings of powerlessness and anxiety about how to prevent her items, being used and dispersed in her absence. She felt responsible for the equipment as it had been allocated to her by the university, and appeared to be in a situation that she did not know how to manage, which disrupted her bodily schema or ease of navigation, leaving her in a position where what was happening was not intelligible, where rather than experiencing ‘I can’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012), she experienced a sense of helplessness, an 'I cannot' and found greater bodily ease working in the library instead. The institutional responses and sense of not being 'seen' fully by others had bodily impacts on Phil and Hannah, disrupting their body schema.

Hence, the social position, or identity, I term Any Body is a further example of the process Arendt (1973) describes, of responses from the environment shaping the space available for a minority group. Participants come to occupy this space of Any
Body as it is what is delineated for them in their lived experience of interaction with the institution and with home students. Their experiences show the inter-connection between social and material space. Phil and Hannah’s responses to becoming Any Body include altering their use of material space.

2.2 Not Body
This theme has both personal and social dimensions and therefore responds to both research sub-questions, ‘How does campus affect students' bodies?’ and ‘What are the social dimensions of student’s experience of campus?’. The following section discusses how campus affects students’ bodies. The significant difference between the position of Any Body and Not Body is that as Any Body participants' presence is acknowledged, but they do not experience acknowledgement of their bodily particularity. As Not Body they experience their presence as not acknowledged at all and the space as containing an implicit sense of bodily exclusion in social environments containing home students.

Linda’s description of her office suggests a continuing process of intersubjective engagement between her colleagues, in which she is not able to participate, as it is couched in language, discourses and social forms with which she feels unfamiliar, rendering it unintelligible for her. There appears not to have been an attempt to seek reciprocal engagement with her and her presence in this environment appears unacknowledged in any meaningful way, positioning her in this space as Not Body. Phil described his experience of what seemed to be a lack of social engagement from the home students and staff in his office, commenting that sometimes they ‘don’t even say Hi or anything’. He interpreted this as being because they did not want to and because they lacked curiosity. Steve described a lack of acknowledgement of his
presence from home students and considered that home students did not need to seek relationship with international students as they already had established social networks. None of the participants described any situation featuring curiosity or a 'coming towards' from home students.

In the definition of a public sphere, or university, as ‘people acting and speaking together’ Arendt (1958, p. 198), participants seem to be outsiders, as they perceive themselves to be excluded from this type of interaction with home students who form the majority group. They do not perceive themselves as recognised by home students, who are perceived as closed to them, and so they become Not Bodies in social spaces with home students. Participants perceived themselves and their perspectives as not visible to the majority group whilst they, in contrast, demonstrated a capacity to see the world from the home students' perspective.

My research contribution deriving from the research sub-question: How does campus affect students' bodies?

My research derives two key theoretical notions of 'embodied familiarity' and 'embodied particularity' to understand both how social relationships between international students occur and how social relationships between international students and home students do not happen. The notion of embodied familiarity draws on Merleau-Ponty's (2012) understanding of pre-reflective perception, that is perception that has not yet been put into thought and suggests that this pre-reflective perception occurs in participants' intersubjective relating whereby they perceive other international people as embodying a form of symmetrical experience to them.

This term is aligned to my concept of embodied particularity. Where participants perceive embodied particularity, they perceive the other person as able to perceive
their particular embodied experience. The embodied familiarity of being international confers a recognition of each other's embodied particularity. These two concepts are an application of Merleau-Ponty's notion of reciprocity to participants' experience.

My final contribution to knowledge is the idea that embodied familiarity may not need to rest entirely upon symmetry of experience and can be conveyed through embodying an orientation towards different others of interest, recognition and valuing of other's embodied particularity.

**Research sub-question 2: What are the a) personal, b) social and c) political dimensions of students’ experience of campus?**

**2a) What are the personal dimensions of students' experience of campus?**

This dimension of research sub-question 2 is addressed through the following themes:

1.1 Evoking Conceptual Thinking

1.2 Inducing Bodily Imagination

Merleau-Ponty (2012) suggests that when person and world meet there is a 'gearing into the world' (p. 262). When participants' bodies meet campus, they bring their past experience, habits and desires which entwine via this 'gearing' to disclose new ways of conceiving the world. Being in a new place offers an opportunity to challenge prior 'lived obedience' (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 143) to forms of thinking, and affords different conceptual possibilities about what makes a good life. Participants' experience of
campus evokes perception about a particular ideological stance and delineates the impress of culture upon the body.

1.1 Evoking conceptual thinking

Participants' engagement with campus inevitably involves comparison and linkages with their home countries, and they use their histories to inform their interpretation of aspects of campus, endorsing Massey’s (1994) conception of space as comprised of multiple flows from past to present (temporal) and from past places to present (spatial). Participants used their interpretation of Port University campus to illuminate and critique aspects of their home culture, tying campus to a wider political context and reflecting what Massey (2005, p. 181) calls a 'relational politics of place'.

For Steve, the view from a window generates a critique of ideological ideas such as the priority of economic progress. The view suggested that economic growth may come at the expense of access to nature and impose stress upon bodies. James associated the library’s engineering works with progress, linked ever-developing technology to professional growth, and contrasted it with Tanzania which he perceived as not so technologically advanced. Linda’s ‘warm response to the provision of equipment led her to suggest that a culture of not talking about mental health, exemplified by her experience in China, made life more stressful. These ideas were experienced through embodied responses to the built environment, communicated a political position, inspired comparison with participants' home culture, and engendered a reflective opportunity to consider and contrast different ways of living. Participants' relationship with the material aspects of campus such as a window, a library and computer were a gateway into a wider narrative, that offered the opportunity for participants to challenge the 'stories' (Massey, 2005, p. 130) they
accrued before coming to Port City. Being in campus appeared to afford a form of critical distance from their home countries and could be seen as offering the form of 'decontextualisation' discussed by Elliot et al. (2016), giving conceptual thinking space or freedom to extend criticality towards what may have been previously taken-for-granted aspects of culture.

This does not invalidate Massey’s conception of space as comprising of temporal and spatial flows of experience but serves to indicate the complexity of this movement which involves a fundamental intertwining of the bodily, material, social and political factors in the journeys participants make in studying at Port City University, which offer opportunities for learning and expansion.

1.2 Inducing bodily imagination

Participants’ relationship to campus shows the intertwining of self and world (Merleau-Ponty, 2012), demonstrated through a process of participant reflections fusing body and place to express aspects of their identity. Steve associates the appearance of a building with the bodies of students who wear colourful clothing and have brightly dyed hair and uses this place-person observation to conceptualize them as passionate. This elicits an embodied sense of care in him. In a similar process, James looks at the library, says that he ‘feels’ it and describes his 'blood' as being in 'academia', whilst Hannah fuses her body with place to identify with a flower which, like her, is 'waiting to bloom'.
My research contribution deriving from the research sub-question: What are the personal dimensions of student’s experience of campus?

Participants relationship with the material environment of campus (objects, buildings, a view) evokes personal reflections upon cultural values suggested by aspects of the current material environment of campus (humanity, technological progress, the prioritizing of wellbeing). This seems to inspire a form of criticality towards previous taken-for-granted aspects of culture. Equally participants fused reflections of self and environment to make sense of theirs and others' identity in place. This suggests a role for considering how the materiality of the student-campus relationship impacts cultural and personal identity and the possible utility for further research on the role of campus and identity formation.

2b) What are the social dimensions of students' experience of campus?

This dimension of research sub-question 2 is addressed through the following themes:

1.3 Conveying embedded cultural values (Social dimension)

1.4 Overcoming Barriers (Social dimension)

2.2 Not Body (Social dimension)

Being in campus puts participants into contact with other people. They observe others' behaviours in campus and derive meaning from this about forms of living with others. Being-in-campus transmits a multi-layered understanding of how to live alongside different others in accordance with a perceived underlying cultural perspective.
1.3 Conveying embedded cultural values

Merleau-Ponty (2012) suggests that place has the power to invite forms of behaviour, Lefebvre (1991) expresses this more directly, arguing that space 'commands bodies' by transmitting 'implicit social and spatial “codes”' (p. 143). These codes are read by participants, and their reading shows the working of Lefebvre’s notions of ‘perceived’, ‘lived’ and ‘conceived’ space. I use Lefebvre’s three notions to show the interrelationships between the everyday, embodied and the political to surface implicit, ideological dimensions of campus spatiality. In using his notions, I adapt the idea of conceived space as, unlike Lefebvre, I do not have data to suggest that Port University campus has been consciously, ‘designed to manipulate those who exist within them’ (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 222). However, I suggest that through inhabiting campus, participants encounter an underlying sense of a social order, derived through their engagement with spatial structures, and perceived by them in an embodied way that may align with Lefebvre’s conceived space. The interaction between perceived and lived space discloses tacit ideological and political discourses, or conceived space. Steve saw members of the public or non-students routinely occupying the campus grounds and was surprised that campus was open to non-students (perceived space). He used this observation of other people to express a notion of ‘lived space’ as a feeling or ‘atmosphere’ of tolerance. In talking about notions of lived and perceived space, Steve implied an underlying social and political dimension or ‘conceived’ space. The freedom for anyone to move in and out of campus rested on an implicit notion of freedom of movement, which he contrasted with the social practices of his university in China. Steve’s experience of campus as open (perceived space) and the notion of freedom of movement (conceived space) existed in dialectical relation between concrete and abstract, which was expressed in
embodied understanding as a feeling or atmosphere of tolerance of others on campus (lived space).

There were tensions between Linda’s experience of conceived, perceived and lived space. She tacitly recognised that campus expressed values of individualism and choice (conceived space) by permitting its students to choose to live either onsite or in the city (perceived space). Whilst this excited her and gave her a sense of new possibilities for living, it evoked anxiety as having choices about how to manage her living situation made her feel less protected by the university than she did in China (lived space). The dialectic between conceived and perceived space resulted in a conflicted embodiment of lived space. Linda’s associations with China (protection) and Port University campus (freedom of choice) inspired anxiety as well as excitement. Her association with her Chinese university offered protection, in contrast to the Port University campus where she was expected to live autonomously. Linda’s perceptions of how the space of campus was used revealed complex and contradictory feelings about self-directedness and personal freedom.

Sarah used the spatiality of campus, inspired by the appearance of a building (perceived space) to reflect on her appreciation of her supervisors’ encouragement and valuing of her ideas (lived space). She implicitly suggested that campus exemplified an underlying culture which valued freedom of thought and intellectual plurality (conceived space) which she contrasted with her perceptions about Singapore which she experienced as less open to pedagogic diversity.

These examples indicate how a political cultural value is perceived through encounters with people in place. Participants seemed to experience Port University
campus as offering people different forms of individual freedom, that contrasted with their prior experience. This is not to suggest that campus directs participants autonomously to think and behave in particular ways, or that campus was designed with political intent, but that there is a dominant social order, expressed spatially and interpreted by participants through their observations of buildings and of how others use these campus buildings. The interactions between Lefebvre’s (1991) different forms of space expanded participants’ notions about how the campus environment shapes what a body can do in campus. For Steve, Linda and Sarah, bodies on Port University campus are free to move in and out, free to live where they want and free to think how they do so, in ways that are new. The participants’ multi-layered experiences demonstrate migration as an unfolding process, actualised and interpreted through experiencing the routine bodily processes of daily living (Madison, 2009).

Campus as an expression of social values, tacitly perceived by students, seems to align with Elliot et al.’s (2016) notions of the ‘hidden curriculum’ as students’ inhabitation of campus offers them a kind of tacit, informal learning about values derived from experience outside of the curriculum. Participants acquired this through self-directed activities that were incidental to their doctoral study. Elliot et al.’s (2016) notion of the hidden curriculum focuses on values and beliefs that are unconsciously transmitted to doctoral students from other people, particularly supervisors. The varied meanings made by participants about campus buildings suggests that imagination may play a part in how students’ shape their own hidden curriculum.

This notion of the materiality of campus conveying social values that may orient students in particular ways, aligns with Arendt’s (1973) and Ahmed’s (2006, 2007)
work on the ways that occupation of social and material space can delineate identity and scope for action.

1.4 Overcoming barriers

Every day offers participants a reminder that they are not at ‘home’, in response they seek out experiences that afford a sense of ‘at homeness’. They use campus in individual ways to buffer the distress evoked by not being at home and also to evoke home in a different country, echoing Madison’s (2010) idea that being away from home can enable a rediscovery of aspects of home. Participants are agentic in finding places on campus where they feel they can be received. This is not just about being received by others but may also about being received by a material environment which offers something familiar or safe. Participants seek out parts of campus to resolve social problems that arise from dislocation in other areas and find places that offer opportunities for consolation. Their actions are pre-reflexive and draw on ‘a form of “understanding” that the body has of the world in which it carries out its operations’ (Moya, 2014, p.1) in places that support the body schema. Participants drew upon this embodied understanding to create homelike feelings on a campus in another country and found places that were comprehensible to them and afforded bodily possibilities not available elsewhere, spaces which were consoling, in part because they were permitted to them (Arendt, 1973). A park, library and concert hall offered environmental invitations that were intelligible to participants, as they drew on their past embodied habits or bodily understanding and offered opportunities for action and a more satisfying way to inhabit campus. These spaces extended participants' bodily comfort and afforded a reciprocal place-person ease not found elsewhere, which they used as a buffer for unease.
Linda, a music teacher in China, used her love of performance to learn about and seek commonality with British culture. She experienced the concert venue as a ‘beckoning of the world’ (Romdenh-Romluc, 2011, p. 121) which she could understand and respond to. The concert venue offered access to culture outside of language, and her bodily response to music afforded a perceived social connection to UK culture. Sometimes participants were unable to understand what the environment required of them, like Sarah, who could not decipher what forms of social contact were expected from her in her office but was soothed by the campus park which evoked memories of visiting parks with her father in Singapore. The park offered connection to family, and a sense of embodied familiarity with home. The park demanded less from her body than the social environment of the office and she could occupy it with ease. In the library, Hannah heard other students talking in her first language of Arabic and felt permitted to initiate conversations with them. The shared language transmitted a cultural ‘at homeness’ which invited Hannah to engage with other students in a way she could not do in her office. In the park with an international student friend, Phil experienced a sense of bodily ease, that he did not experience in his office or home.

Participants’ use of campus shows them seeking out places that not only feel more intelligible to them than other places on campus, but also offer them the experience of being intelligible to the social environment in a more meaningful way. In these places, campus receives them, and they are able to inhabit it with ease. These places are not home, yet offer a form of ‘at homeness’, with components of embodied familiarity and embodied intelligibility that they use to negotiate difficulties arising from cultural unfamiliarity. In this relational person-campus process,
participants, ‘receive the responses they anticipate from the world’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p. 261), which offer ontological security in a different and challenging environment.

Merleau-Ponty's (2012) theorisation sets up an interesting question about the role of the places chosen by participants and he refers to human relationship with nonhumans as ‘a muddled problem for my body to solve’ (p.214) because he attributes a vague sense of agency to the material describing it as ‘beckoning’ (p. 214) the person. Whilst I accept the intertwining and indivisibility of body and world as put forth by Merleau-Ponty, I am reluctant to ascribe a form of agency to the material that describes a place as beckoning a person. Instead, I prefer to draw upon Ahmed’s (2006, 2007) idea of places being impregnated with attitudes and values of the people in power, which are transmitted through people to other people, pre-reflexively, until it can seem as if the values are so ingrained as to belong to the place. Participants enter spaces formed by others, spaces where they are a minority, where, as Ahmed states, they encounter the ‘skin of the social’ in spaces, ‘shaped by the “impressions” left by others’ (Ahmed, 2006, p. 9). This can be experienced bodily, as a ‘texture’ or as a pressure to behave in a certain way. Many of the participants experienced discomfort in their offices, spaces which they occupied with others, spaces shaped before their arrival. Some participants struggled to be seen and taken account of by others in their offices. In response, they sought out places that were easier on the skin, spaces that allowed bodily ease and respite. A park, concert hall and library are places designed to be open to others and feature across many cultures. They offered participants an anchor point in a new and different world, an
evocation of the familiar and an experience of being, albeit temporarily, a body in place, in a space that can be inhabited with ease.

Places can be used as sites of consolation, as a means of responding to different forms of isolation evoked through cultural dislocation (Cantor, 2020; Erichsen & Bolliger, 2011) and reflect difficulties in accessing and integrating in peer cultures (Deem and Brehony, 2000). Issues of fitting in to the social office culture were discussed by four of the eight participants, and may indicate a fruitful area of further exploration, as bodily discomfort and feelings of isolation in offices could have wider and multiple impacts on students' wellbeing and academic progress (Hopwood and Paulson, 2012). The students' office-related social isolation and discomfort illustrates the potential bodily impact of navigating different socio-cultural and academic environments and suggests that institutions would do well to take more account of embodied aspects of being-in-campus (Hopwood and Paulson, 2012).

2.2 Not Body (Social dimension)

Participants wish for engagement with home students, as well as with other international students, and are prepared to undertake considerable efforts to make this sort of intersubjective relationship possible, often by addressing what they perceive as deficits within themselves. Linda described not going into her office in the mornings to give herself time at home to learn English, and to research Western cultural and academic discourses, to facilitate more satisfying relationships with her ‘home’ student colleagues. Sarah described the bodily discomforts of sitting in her office trying to figure out what was expected of her socially, and specifically what was expected from her body to transmit the required level of sociality,
Participants are active in seeking ways to enable social engagement with home students, but this does not seem to result in the establishment of reciprocal relationships, involving embodied familiarity or acknowledgment of their embodied particularity. This is consistent with Koehne’s (2006) description of how, despite international students’ efforts to communicate with others, often these efforts were not successful.

I make sense of the apparent mismatch between participants’ continuing bodily orientation towards engagement, the efforts they make, and the seeming lack of result, by drawing on Arendt’s (1958) thinking about agency. Arendt (1958) suggests that agency, the possibility of bringing about action, is only possible when a person is acknowledged by others. Where a person is not acknowledged, they do not impact others, meaning that it is possible to be busy and active, yet not effective, or agentic, because their activities are not ‘seen’ or acknowledged by another.

I suggest that the notion of there being a lack of intersubjectivity in social relationships, impeding participants’ agency, adds to our understanding of how participants associated other international bodies with friendship, support and guidance. With other international students, they had agency to achieve social connection. They were received by other international students and able to share social life. The dialogue they experienced with other international bodies enabled a co-creation of the world (Merleau-Ponty 2012; Arendt, 1958). In forming these relationships, participants enacted agency with others to whom they appeared, and who appeared to them. I argue therefore that discourses which position international students in deficit are mistaken. The fact that more of participants’ relationships are with other international students does not suggest a lack of agency or desire in
seeking to form social relationships with others, but rather illustrates the limited scope for agency that is permitted to them, circumscribed by the degree to which others allow them to appear.

A university offers students the opportunity to experience belonging to a community of different people. By committing to participate in university life, all students have taken a step outside of their prior, familiar territory and have the potential to experience new ways of living and learning. It is surely the case that fundamental to the educative task of a university is enabling its students to develop and enhance their capacities for critical, reflective thinking (Harvey et al., 1997; Barnett, 1997) about things other or wider than themselves. The lack of engagement between the two groups seems a lost opportunity for both home and international students to learn about each other, and by doing so conceive of themselves as part of a ‘we’, living within a co-created world of multiple and diverse others, in a shared space (Arendt, 1958).

Arendt’s (1958) ideas about ways that we ‘appear to each other’ and the importance of this process in establishing the possibility for intersubjective relationship, of sharing a public space, and developing critical thinking, illustrate the process of exclusion of participants from the social space and give a way to reflect upon with wider political aspects of exclusion. I suggest that Arendt’s thinking is enhanced by taking account of the embodied nature of what is involved in processes of mutual recognition. Whilst Arendt’s (1973) theorising about the ways that majority groups shape the space available for minority groups to develop identity and participate in the world illustrates the Findings, considering the impact on each person’s body schema (Merleau-Ponty, 2012) gives a way of understanding how the processes described by Arendt work,
and highlights the interconnection between social and material space. Arendt’s notion of agency aligns closely with this last point, rather than simply being an individual determination to action, agency is also what is permitted to a person by the environment they are in, depending on the degree to which they are acknowledged. This understanding challenges discourses which suggest international students do not seek, or show agency in seeking, engagement and relationship with home students or their wider institutions.

**My research contribution deriving from the research sub-question: What are the social dimensions of student’s experience of campus?**

This research possibly indicates a fruitful direction to extend and develop a notion of a hidden curriculum suggesting a role for buildings as 'silent teachers' (Edwards, 2000, p. vii), shaping students' learning, communicating socio-cultural values and creating unintended and unexpected learning outcomes outside of the formal curriculum (Jandric and Loretto, 2020).

It also suggests a role for places on campus as a buffer for cultural dislocation and draws attention to the potential of public spaces such as parks or libraries to offer sufficient familiarity across cultures as to evoke a pre-reflective, embodied response of ease.

Finally, this research applies Arendt's (1958) notion of agency as appearing to others to social life on a university campus and aligns her thinking with Merleau-Ponty's body schema which offers an explanation of potential embodied consequences of Arendt's notions of agency.
2c) What are the political dimensions of students' experience of campus?

This dimension of research sub-question 2 is addressed through the following themes:

2.3 No Body

2.4 Contested Body

The next sections are concerned with the categories of No Body and Contested Body and explore participants' political and socio-material position in the space of Port University campus. As the focus here is more on their bodily characteristics rather than the identity of being an international student, I draw more on Ahmed’s (2006, 2007) work to theorise what is happening, and suggest these discussions illustrate ways that her thinking aligns with the Arendtian frame I have used so far. I argue that my findings support the critiques of Merleau-Ponty’s (2012) body schema, which assert its lack of recognition of the bodily and existential impacts of being black in a world constructed by and for whiteness (Fanon, 1967; Ahmed, 2007; Lewis, 2018).

2.3 No Body

This section discusses the category of No Body, where participants perceive an implied requirement from majority others to erase their experience of discrimination. International students' bodies feature within wider political discourse, seen as part of a politically undesirable net migration figure (Malik, 2023; Syal, 2023) and as attracting ‘hostility in the policy environment’ (Thomson, 2023), despite their overwhelmingly positive contribution to the UK economy (Canings, Halterbeck and
Conlon, 2023). Port City has one of the lowest rates of participation in higher education in the UK and in the city 94% of people identified as white (see Chapter 1). In a political discourse centred upon the removal of foreign bodies (Malik, 2023; Waters, 2018), and in a context of anti-Asian discrimination in the UK (Smith, 2021; Matzuda, 2021), two Asian participants experienced pressure to erase incidents arising from the tensions of being a minority ethnic body in a white environment.

The social context impacted their bodies and forced them to negotiate with others’ conceptions of them as foreign bodies, pressurising them to enact forms of embodied self-erasure, shaping ways they could inhabit space, their subjectivity and their identities. Merleau-Ponty (2012) suggests that we do not perceive another in isolation from, but as situated in, the world. When we see others in-the-world, we see the world as requiring certain actions from them. Our perception of ourselves and others is grounded in a social context which expects certain actions from us. Accordingly, participants implicitly perceive other bodies as entwined with the social context and understand the social context and other people as requiring particular actions from them. Following a bodily attack, the police persuaded Steve not to report it and Steve understood that he was being asked by someone with socially sanctioned power to erase his body from official record to protect a British person. Steve’s experience with the Police Officer illustrates the critique of Merleau-Ponty’s theory of the body schema (Fanon, 1967; Lewis, 2018; Ahmed, 2007; Weate, 2001). Steve’s experience illustrates the way Merleau-Ponty appears not take account of the degree to which being able to move at ease through an accessible, intelligible, world involves the privilege of being received reciprocally in that world. In this case, both the Police Officer and the perpetrator of the violence against Steve had a perceptual ease
conferred through familiarity with the British culture, and their bodies’ right to inhabit the space was not challenged or contested. In the context of Port City, Steve stood out as different: not only was his body different to the majority, but as a relatively recent visitor to Port City, he was unfamiliar with British law and his legal rights. He did not have the ‘familiar manner of handling the world’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p. 370) that the Police Officer and perpetrator had. The encounter subjected Steve to being constructed as other, and as required to navigate a perceptual framework that was neither fully meaningful nor fully available to him. Steve’s experience seems to exemplify the points raised by writers such as Lewis (2018) and Ahmed (2007), who suggest that race is part of our embodied relation to others. Being embodied, the fact of our race enacts or directs social relationships in a way that is tacit and often prior to thought, and so there is a racialised aspect of the body schema. Drawing on Ahmed (2007), Lewis (2018) and Fanon (1967), I suggest that whilst the Police Officer consciously invited Steve not to report the violence, he may have been pre-reflectively enacting power relations based on a historically ingrained bodily directness or orientation towards the perpetrator, a British man, but not to Steve, despite Steve being the victim of a crime. Steve could not evoke the same bodily familiarity in the Police Officer as the perpetrator, as he was neither British nor white.

Given the preponderance of white bodies in Port City, it is possible that its citizens’ body schemas may pre-reflectively direct them towards an identification with other white bodies, as offering a basis for bodily familiarity. Steve’s presence as a different kind of body in this space may have provoked a sense of the unfamiliar, offering a sort of un-ease to be resisted, rather than ease in recognising that other’s bodies are like their own. Steve’s experience as a minority ethnic person seems to exemplify
‘race disparities’ (Police Race Action Plan, 2022), may indicate institutional racism in the police (Casey, 2023) and racism in society as a whole. When Steve spoke to his supervisor, she told him to ignore violent people because he could not change the system, possibly advocating this as a form of survival strategy to avoid drawing attention to himself and keep Steve safe. On another occasion, Steve and his friend left a burger bar after his right to be present in that space was aggressively disputed. Through these experiences, it was communicated to him that his body was not as valuable as a British body, that there were social and material spaces not permissible for him to inhabit, and that trying to do so could be dangerous.

The identity delineated for Steve here is of being foreign, through processes ranging from national public discourse to pre-reflective bodily enactments that are produced by, and reinforce, historic and habitual structures of inclusion and exclusion, privilege and oppression, and which require Steve not to assert his experience. The space permitted to him was restrictive and he experienced it as a demand to erase himself, socially and materially. He appeared to find his situation unintelligible, and his possible courses of action limited. In this situation, there was no meaningful acknowledgement of bodily familiarity with him, nor of his bodily particularity, and he experienced himself without agency to respond except with the self-erasure required of him in not pressing charges, or in removing himself from the burger bar.

In her encounters with white friends, Sarah understood that they perceived her disclosures about her experience of racism as a personal attack on them. In response, she sought to think about how the world looked to them and decided that she did not want to cause distress to them, or to leave them with feelings of helplessness. Consequently, she stopped talking with her friends about the racism
she encountered. She felt responsible for inflicting feelings of discomfort on white others, who perceived her as an aggressor when she tried to open up a dialogue about her experience. Her white friends, by not wanting to engage with her feelings, constructed themselves as victims of Sarah and focused Sarah’s attention on caring for their discomfort. Sarah’s friends seemed to be re-enacting a social order oriented around not disrupting the status of whiteness. By seeing themselves as victims and casting Sarah as the cause of tension, the friends shut down the possibility of examining their positions of power, and their function as part of a white culture that engendered racism towards minorities, an example seemingly of ‘white fragility’ (Applebaum, 2017; DiAngelo, 2011). The friends constructed the social space between themselves and Sarah, and through their reluctance to engage with racism, interpellated Sarah to desist from challenging the social order, which privileged whiteness, and required those who were not white to inhabit a negative, to be ‘not’ people (Ahmed, 2007, p. 161). By construing their discomfort as an individual matter evoked by Sarah, they perpetuated a distortion that supported the social order (and their comfort), at the cost of requiring Sarah to erase her experience. If agency is founded upon appearing to others (Arendt, 1958), by not permitting Sarah the space to express and engage in dialogue, she was not permitted to be seen as part of the wider social world. Hence, her agentic capacity for action and expression was curtailed, and she ‘erased’ her painful experience from others’ consideration by ‘no longer talking to white people about race’ (Eddo-Lodge, 2018).

These explicit and implicit requests to self-erase their experiences to accommodate the interests of the white majority group indicate a hierarchy of concern, which Steve and Sarah perceive but feel obliged to accept and comply with, even though this
compliance is an enactment of structures of domination that oppress them. These experiences of encountering social structures and processes that reproduce and support the needs of a more powerful majority, through limiting the space available to minority groups, evoked bodily distress.

James and Tina described their contribution to the university in monetary terms (Tina) or in reputational terms due to undertaking research and writing academic papers (James). It is possible that in part this arose from an experience of being positioned as an ‘international student’. However, Tina was also explicit in her wish to facilitate more Sri Lankan students coming to Port University, seeking more bodies like hers on the campus for the opportunity of greater embodied familiarity, specifically with Sri Lankan bodies (see Chapter 4). This also seemed to be the case for James, although he did not specifically argue that there should be greater numbers of students from Tanzania as Tina did, he was explicit in about his wish for greater numbers of students at the university ‘from other parts of the world’. Some of participants explicitly mentioned feeling valued by particular university staff, but only James and Tina expressed a sense of how they may be perceived on a wider institutional level, suggesting that there may be some institutional benefit to more overt messaging affirming appreciation of the non-monetary, human benefits of having international students on campus (Kozakova, 2023; Waters, 2020). Tina and James did not represent their embodied value to the university as people who could contribute to intersubjective connection and reflective sharing of space (Arendt, 1958). This is also a sort of self-erasure, in which, I suggest, James and Tina may have constructed themselves as commercially or academically valuable partly out of
a felt, but not articulated (pre-reflective) perception of the identities and the social space they are permitted to inhabit.

I noted above that Merleau-Ponty (2012) suggests human relating happens in symmetry, that communication rests on a shared feeling of being-in-the-world with others, who co-perceive each other in similar ways. He suggests that having a body makes us aware of others' bodies in the same way that we are aware of our own. Participants' experience of sharing an inter-corporeal world with others is not like this. Participants recognise that the environment produces expectations and opportunities for bodily action from others, which seem not to be symmetrically applied to them, leading to a perception of difference in category of person (international rather than home student), and category of body (foreign, not white), associated with more restricted scope for action. Participants felt compelled to enact discourses that erased their particularity, and their experiences suggest that the social order is not able to accommodate the singularity of participants' experience, particularly when it involves aggression from British people towards them. Participants live in an asymmetrical context where they are not experienced by the majority group or other people in power as, 'a miraculous prolongation of my own intentions' (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p. 354). They extend humanity, based on a conception of a shared world, towards others but this is not reciprocated, leaving them without agency to do more than comply with the requests of those with more power and occupy the space afforded to them on these terms.

The next section is concerned with occasions where rather than facing asymmetry, students experienced attacks on their presence alongside majority others.
2.4 Contested Body

Participants experienced their bodies as attracting verbal and physical aggression from other people, disputing their entitlement to inhabit the space. Steve and Sarah experienced incidents both in the city and on campus which drew their attention to how others judged their appearance and construed them as a body available for verbal and physical attack. These constructions forced participants to become aware of how their occupation in the city and campus could be disputed.

The racism exposed instances of attack and contestation of Sarah and Steve’s existence in place by others who appeared to permit themselves to define Sarah and Steve’s social space. Steve and Sarah's skin colour made their bodies available to be singled out and interrupted, and they found themselves objectified as, ‘Chink’, ‘thief’, 'import bride' and perceptually ‘stopped’ (Ahmed, 2006, 2007) by others' notions of them. The racist incidents had the power to shape how they occupied campus and city with Sarah avoiding the Student Union outside of work, and Steve evacuating a burger bar for fear of attack. Both talked about the lingering bodily effects of racist encounters. Their scope to counter and address the racism towards their bodies was limited by others' wish not to know (Sarah’s white friends), a request not to report (the Police Officer) and was not regarded an institutional matter (the Advice Centre) leaving them with little scope for agency.

Their encounters with racist others exposed Steve and Sarah to discourses that positioned them in deficit, and possibly indicated a set of ‘place myths’ (Shields, 2007), or perhaps more accurately ‘national myths’, sedimented in consciousness and centred around a discursive interpretation of international bodies as representing some form of threat (Trilling, 2020; Braverman, 2023; Baker, 2020). Given the
national political picture, I suggest that, whilst the local economic context of deprivation may have contributed towards the anti-Asian attitudes directed towards Steve and Sarah, there is insufficient evidence to locate these attitudes as belonging, or intrinsic to, Port City. Sarah was constructed as someone who had come to ‘steal’ jobs, as using a British man to gain a British passport and as an import bride. Steve was constructed as a threat to a British man’s future and as someone who did not ‘know his place’ in expecting to be served before a British person. These interpretations of their bodies, expressed in public places such as supermarkets, burger bars and the street, suggested that some local people perceived themselves as having permission to single Steve and Sarah out in this manner, enabled not just by the whiteness of the body schema (Merleau-Ponty, 2012; Ahmed, 2007), but also potentially by pervasive wider socio-political narratives constructing migrants as undesirable bodies. It is possible that lack of population diversity engenders a lack of exposure to diverse others in everyday contexts which, when combined with economic deprivation, may have fuelled negative attitudes towards people from other countries (Magne, 2019), but given the national prevalence of anti-Asian discrimination, it is difficult to claim it as an entirely local phenomenon. I therefore suggest that Steve and Sarah’s experiences attest to Frampton, Smith and Smithies (2022) national finding of disproportionate anti-Asian discrimination towards international students.

My research contribution deriving from the research sub-question: What are the political dimensions of student’s experience of campus?

The political dimension of participants’ experience of campus reveals what can happen when participants’ embodied particularity appears not to be perceived by
members of the majority group, who seem not to experience an embodied familiarity with them and seem to construct them as other. This can have the effect of excluding participants' bodies from public spaces and their experience from discourse.

This research has also explicated a process through which people may experience themselves as being invited to comply with systems that could be seen as oppressing them.

**Intersection of themes pertaining to embodied experience of academic spaces to respond to the question, 'How do international doctoral students experience the Port City campus?**

Participants' experience of academic spaces involves intersecting and multiple themes which combine to respond to the main and general Research Question, 'How do international doctoral students experience the Port City campus?'. I choose to highlight this intersection of themes to focus on participants' embodied experience or bodily orientation towards their studies, and their intersubjective, reciprocal relationship with institutional spaces and with other students (home and international). I suggest that this involves navigating the intertwined material and social dimensions of academic space.

Discourses around academic mobility suggest the possibility of academic culture shock (Searle and Ward, 1990; Brown and Holloway, 2008) and that the academic processes are embodied, social and affective (Adely, 2010; McAlpine, 2012). Loneliness has been identified as a significant problem (Janta et al., 2014; Sawir et al., 2008), leading to suggestions that there is a need for universities to facilitate multiple channels of networking (Mittelmeir et al., 2018).
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Navigating academic spaces can offer reciprocal and exciting academic opportunities, with James seeing his 'blood' (inducing bodily imagination) as located in academia and Sarah relishing the opening up of academic possibilities that were closed to her in Singapore (conveying embedded values). They tied their academic flourishing to campus, and its materiality symbolized their identity growth as academics. Conversely, the office was often a site of anxiety and stress for participants, evoking forms of withdrawal from the workspace as a coping strategy. Phil (Any body, Overcoming barriers), Sarah (Overcoming barriers), Linda (Not body) and Hannah (Overcoming barriers) all used withdrawal from the office to survive the uncomfortable, embodied effects of cultural unfamiliarity, and in Phil's case to find a material space to support his work. Deborah (Evoking conceptual thinking) missed the camaraderie of her former university office, feeling isolated in her Port University campus office. Paying attention to the intersection of themes concerning the embodied effects of being in academic spaces such as the office yields a complex picture of how academic mobility can be both enhanced and challenged through material spaces. Being in offices with others can expose students to cultural unfamiliarity and loneliness, which disrupts their body schema (Merleau-Ponty, 2021), evokes withdrawal and reduces the potential for participation with others in these spaces. Participation in academic environments involves knowing the social and cultural 'rules' of participation (determined by the majority group and culture) and I suggest that this is a subtle way that material academic spaces can be delineated and excluding for participants, with some academic spaces experienced as more difficult to occupy than others. It is telling that these problematic aspects were not present for James and Steve, both of whom worked in offices with a majority international population. It also shows that simply placing international and home
doctoral students in offices together may not be sufficient to evoke intersubjective relating, and the type of embodied recognition that engenders feelings of inclusion. Creating multiple networking possibilities on campus, as suggested by Mittelmeir et al. (2018), may similarly run the risk of reproducing the problematic embodied aspects of being in the office, unless careful attention is paid to the quality and design so that such networks contain genuine dialogic potential and opportunities for exposure to each other's standpoints and expertise.

**My research contribution deriving from the research question: 'How do international doctoral students experience the Port City campus?'**

Social inclusion in academic settings seems to involve a process of embodied familiarity. Where this is not perceived, academic spaces can be perceived as uncomfortable to occupy and can precipitate bodily withdrawal to a site that is perceived to offer greater embodied ease.

This theme highlights the intertwining of embodied, material and social aspects and suggests academic wellbeing may have a spatio-social component.

**Summary**

This chapter has demonstrated how the themes respond to the research questions and has delineated the potential contribution the research offers to the field of international student studies and to studies of student-campus relations.

Drawing on Merleau-Ponty's (2012) theorizing about the body schema, Arendt's about agency (1958) and Ahmed's about whiteness (2007), the chapter outlined the importance of embodied familiarity and embodied particularity showing the consequences for intersubjectivity when these are not perceived in others. Drawing
on Lefebvre (1991) I discussed the potential of material spaces such as buildings, to convey or transmit cultural values.

Finally, the chapter discussed how social and political processes can have spatial impacts that can either enhance or restrict participation in campus and city.
Chapter 6 - Conclusion

Introduction

This thesis inquired into international doctoral students' experience of the Port University campus. Previous research highlighted that despite a global drive to recruit more international students, there has been insufficient attention paid to the quality and detail of the everyday experiences of these students, with Hopwood and Paulson (2012) referring to doctoral students' bodies, as an ‘absent presence’ (p. 669). Taking an embodied phenomenological approach (Merleau-Ponty, 2012), I explored the international doctoral student experience from a different angle, that of campus and that of bodies in campus. I was interested how campus affected international doctoral students' bodies. The research was situated within a paradoxical political and social context, which constructed international students' bodies both as desirable ‘cash cows’ (Diamantopoulos, 2002; Haugh, 2008; Robertson, 2011) and as part of an undesirable immigration narrative (Malik, 2023; Syal, 2023). Given this context, I sought to understand the embodied, personal, social and political dimensions of international doctoral students' experience of campus from their perspective. Throughout the thesis I drew on Merleau-Ponty (2012), Ahmed (2006, 2007) and Arendt (1958, 1973). These theorists augment each other, Merleau-Ponty (2012) provided the theoretical underpinnings of the thesis through his linking of the body to the social; Ahmed (2006, 2007) illustrated the interconnectedness of the material and social through her work on how bodies are/are not permitted to move in space and Arendt (1958, 1973) provided a link from the social to the political, and illustrated the
political significance of the social space and relations permitted to international doctoral students.

I summarise my findings in response to the research questions and I consider the limitations of this research, followed by a discussion of the value, contribution and significance of my work. I respond to the ‘Now what?’ question by suggesting how my findings may form part of a future and wider development of thinking about how campus is experienced by students.

**How do international doctoral students experience the Port City campus?**

Students use campus to extend their sense of identity. Being-in-campus offers opportunities for cultural comparison and critique and enables friendships with fellow international students through processes of embodied familiarity. Students use campus to achieve bodily ease as a buffer to feelings evoked through dislocation.

Campus experiences interrupt students' institutional, academic and social relationships - all of which are bound up with their body schemas (Merleau-Ponty, 2012) - through processes that fail to recognise their embodied particularity, exclude their bodies from social space with home students, evoke withdrawal from academic spaces and contest or assail their right to be in place.

**How does campus affect students' bodies?**

I used Merleau-Ponty's (2012) theories about embodiment, the body schema and intersubjectivity to theorise participants' relationships with others and derive my concepts of embodied familiarity and embodied particularity.
Students' experience of campus is profoundly embodied, their bodies disclose feelings about themselves and others. Embodied feelings precede consciousness and are used as a base to explore consciousness (Merleau-Ponty, 2012). Embodiment forms the basis of their human connection with others through reciprocal recognition of embodied familiarity and embodied particularity. The absence of these evokes bodily unease. 'Lived space' (Lefebvre, 1991) is a felt dimension evoking a range of bodily feelings including tolerance, warm feelings, anxiety and excitement.

Participants seek relationships with others who share their experience of being an international student, finding intersubjective recognition and acknowledgement, based on the embodied familiarity of being international. Participants perceive each other as human subjects, enabling them to share reciprocal social space. This embodied seeking of relationship and intersubjective connection seems to involve a kind of ‘orientation towards’ connection with the other, which enables embodied familiarity, despite there being significant differences between them. These pre-reflective, bodily relationships offer a form of recognition that confers ease and scope for action together. The international friendships are formed across countries and cultures occurring, for example, between Chinese and French students, Chinese and Greek students, Sri Lankan and Indian students and involved a range of social activities.

Participants reach towards Port City University for acknowledgment and recognition of their particularity, but at points receive general or ‘disembodied’ responses that do not acknowledge the particular embodied components of their problems, and as such do not seem to be experienced by the participants as orientated towards them.
Consequently the advice given is perceived as unintelligible and unusable. These experiences disrupt their body schema (Merleau-Ponty, 2012) or ease of passage in the world.

**What are the personal, social and political dimensions of student's experience of campus?**

Campus is more than a material backdrop to students' life. Lefebvre (1991) provided a means to theorise and illuminate participants' embodied observations and interpretations of the materiality of campus.

Using Lefebvre (1991) I surfaced ideological dimensions of Port University campus illuminating western values of freedom of movement, freedom of thought and freedom of choice. Participants use their personal interpretations of material aspects of campus to consider the values suggested to them through being in Port University campus, contrasting them their home countries and making thoughtful and critical observations about the embodied impacts of these values.

Campus is used by students as an active constituent of meaning-making of being-in-place, and simultaneously of past places, and could be construed as part of a 'hidden curriculum' (Eliot et al., 2016) or a 'silent teacher' (Edwards, 2000). Experience of campus orientates bodies in particular ways including socio-politically.

Students wish for social relations with home students but perceive this as denied to them, despite their efforts, and despite sharing offices and campus facilities. They experience a form of invisibility (Not Body) in relation to home students which restricts their scope to participate in social and academic activity with them. This confers an implicit social-spatial restriction of students' social mobility. I drew on
Arendt's (1958) ideas about agency as appearing to others to explain how not being 'seen' by others, limited students' scope for action with political, social and spatial consequences. I applied her thinking to suggest how majority groups may delineate the identity and space minority groups are permitted to occupy.

Students manage the bodily stressors of cultural dislocation by finding places on campus that are intelligible to them, offer a form of familiarity that is welcoming, and buffers the distressing effects of dislocation.

Students experience others' meanings made of their bodily appearance. I applied Ahmed's (2006, 2007) work on the pervasiveness of whiteness and her critique of Merleau-Ponty's body schema to theorise the socio-spatial impacts of the bodily contestation of students' bodies. These interpretations expose the pervasive whiteness (Ahmed, 2007) of the local and institutional context, within which some students' Asian bodies stand out, and are vulnerable to other's interpretations of their right to be in place. Some students perceive a pressure to erase their experience of hostility from others, through pressures not to report instances of violence or talk about experiences of racism with white people.

I suggest that discourses involved in the Brexit vote, and from hostile migratory reporting, may feed into how international students are perceived in Port City.

**Limitations**

Being a white researcher conducting my research in English may have impacted upon what participants chose to share, with the possibility that they may have felt inhibited to criticise the culture of the researcher to the researcher. I suggest that this may have been mitigated by participants' awareness and experience of research.
ethics around confidentiality, and of the importance of research as a means of inquiry into experience. Although participants were proficient at communicating in English, it was not, apart from Deborah, their first language, and ideally future research could benefit from the involvement of co-national researchers, who could offer linguistic and cultural knowledge and nuanced understanding. Given that my research highlighted the importance of embodied familiarity, I suggest that researcher embodied familiarity could enhance the research process and output. I suggest that participants perceived an embodied recognition of my positive interest in them which facilitated a sense of embodied familiarity and offered conditions for a recognition of their embodied particularity.

I am aware that not asking participants to select a pseudonym exposed my implicit blind spot (see chapter 3) and left me with a dilemma, which I resolved by giving participants standard British names. This felt like an inappropriate cultural imposition but seemed the 'least bad' option. In future research I will ask participants to select their pseudonym, giving them choice over how they want to be represented.

As a counsellor I have a strong ethical awareness of the importance of confidentiality, but the conditions of this research taught me more about the nature of research confidentiality. In Chapter 3 I described how I had failed to consider how the public nature of a walking interview had the potential for participants to meet non-participants and face their inquiries into our activities. Whilst participants were relaxed about any encounters on our walks and seemed happy to talk about the research with others, I realised that, as with counselling, confidentiality is something that may require negotiating 'on the move' and in response to unexpected
circumstances, rather than being seen as a fixed agreement made at the beginning of research.

**Claims**

Bodies are an important 'way in' to access pre-reflective experiences that have not been put into words, and inquiry into embodied aspects of day to day living surfaces felt dimensions of the international doctoral student experience. The body becomes then both the question and answer to understanding a valuable research focus, augmenting more cognate approaches.

Relating to others is embodied: when we experience aspects of familiarity in another person and they in us, it forms the basis of an intersubjective reciprocity that precedes and transcends language. Embodied relating occurs when a person experiences another as a human subject and is experienced by them as a human subject (Merleau-Ponty, 2012). This appears not to be happening between home and international students, and I suggest paying attention to the body as a point of entry and basis for resolving this issue, rather than using verbal means such as consciousness-raising activities, as a good way forward. It also explains why simply placing different groups together in an office may not be sufficient to engender embodied familiarity and social connection, as international doctoral students may not experience home students as oriented towards forming social bonds with them.

If we are unable to perceive another person as a subject like ourselves, they do not appear to us as part of our common social world, inviting the potential for their perspectives and personhood to seem invisible, or worse to invite objectification, stereotyping and prejudice (Arendt, 1958). When bodies do not come together
meaningfully and purposefully in a shared endeavour it is likely that they will not do so socially and may remain separated. I suggest that meaningful, reciprocal intersubjectivity might depend on finding aspects of shared embodiment. Later I discuss the wider political importance of doing this, and why universities are a good environment for this work.

Contribution

I have integrated three key philosophers building on their theorising and applying it to international doctoral students and campus. By looking at the bodily processes underlying Ahmed and Arendt’s theories, I show how pre-reflective embodiment can separate us from others and delineate the space we are permitted to occupy.

I have shown the creative potential inherent in the experience of the materiality of campus, as means for students to understand processes of mobility from there to here, evoking critical comparison. I have shown how campus can inspire reflection on identity, particularly academic identity and suggest different forms of freedom.

I have surfaced how pre-reflective processes underlie social relating on campus, and the importance of paying attention to embodied processes of familiarity and particularity. I have shown that while a context of ‘whiteness’ (Ahmed, 2006, 2007) may shape the space available for international students, the bonds formed between international students of multiple ethnicities, including white international students, suggest that when students perceive a positive orientation towards them, and experience recognition of embodied familiarity and of their bodily particularity, this forms a basis for intersubjective relationships.
My walking methods gave autonomy and agency to participants. By conjoining together in this activity, we shared an embodied being-in-the-world, I navigated their worlds with them in an engagement that extended the body schema and offered an experience of ‘I can’ (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, see chapter 2), and by demonstrating my positive orientation towards being with them, offered a fruitful possibility for embodied relating, recognition of their bodily particularity and the conditions for intersubjectivity.

**Implications**

This research has uncovered some ‘dark spaces’ (Bengsten and Barnett, 2017), and has shown how dwelling with these can disclose aspects that may be excluded from dominant discourses. Dwelling with darkness can form an ethical stance towards valuing the individual, even if their experiences are unexpected or do not conform to what is expected or desired. My work showed how Port University offered students a positive learning experience, but the conditions of that learning sometimes happened in uncomfortable environments amidst perceived experiences of marginalisation and institutional indifference. My research raises a wider question as to where universities situate themselves in the discourse about immigration and their commitment to counter narratives that conflate international students with undesirable migration.

My findings about the significance of embodied familiarity suggest that developing training for staff to deepen understanding of the ‘felt’ or embodied implications of moving to another culture, could support staff to ‘see’ the bodily particularity of students and avoid ‘disembodied’ or generalised responses to international students.
Significance

International doctoral students are oriented towards forming reciprocal relationships with both the institution and with other people, including home and fellow international students. This involves seeking out aspects of embodied familiarity and relationships where their bodily particularity is recognised. Shared ethnicity and cultural familiarity do not seem essential for recognition of embodied familiarity and particularity. Aspects of embodied familiarity may include shared experience of being international, shared ethnicity and culture and shared endeavours. The minimum requirement for recognition of embodied familiarity is a relationship where the other person also has an orientation towards relationship. This orientation towards another person enables recognition and confers agency to the person who is seen. This suggests why, for example, French and Chinese students may become friends in a way that British home students and Chinese students seem not to: international doctoral students do not perceive an orientation towards them from home students.

International students’ bodily orientation towards another is impeded by the meanings made of their bodies which designate them as Any and Not Bodies or as a ‘foreign body’ (reported as No and Contested Bodies). Others’ meanings of their bodies have spatial implications, designating how international students are permitted to occupy social and material spaces. I reported this as interrupting their body schemas and bodily extending in the campus and city. My focus on embodiment and the body schema shows that processes of exclusion and discrimination do not begin in discourse but in a pre-reflective bodily orientation, which may not be cognate or articulated.
The social processes that Arendt describes, of attribution of identity and permission to occupy space are fundamentally bodily transactions and they impact the material space that bodies can occupy. Students can experience unease in social situations where they do not experience others as having a bodily orientation towards intersubjective relationship with them. In response, students seek out spaces where they find greater ease. Students’ experience of others’ orientations towards them can impact their bodily ease and the material and social space they choose to occupy.

My thesis describes the embodied processes underlying the social features described by Arendt (1958). It's focus on embodied familiarity and embodied particularity were derived from Merleau-Ponty's (2012) ideas about the body schema and theories about intersubjectivity which complements Ahmed's (2007) thinking on the ways that the social world accommodates some bodies with more ease than others. Ahmed's theorising about whiteness may explain how others might not be orientated towards international students.

My research of international doctoral students' social experience could be perceived as research into an essentially private matter, outside the realms of institutional scope and influence, a personal matter about who chooses to relate with whom. However, there are wider implications to this social experience, perhaps the most important being that both home and international students appear to gain minimal exposure to each other’s opinions, perspectives and culture, potentially narrowing intercultural understanding and risking the possibility of minority perspectives becoming marginalised within social, institutional and public discourse. This could widen the possibility for misunderstandings and assumptions to be formed, and in the
worst-case scenario, could unwittingly be used to enact harmful practices (Arendt, 1973). This research evoked Arendt’s question about what makes it bearable for us to live with other people, strangers, forever, in the same world, and makes it possible for them to bear with us (Arendt, 1994, p. 332).

What participants appear to suggest is that the ‘bearing with’ they experience can be tinged with indifference, and exclusion. Arendt’s work illustrates how problems ensue when people do not demonstrate the ability to think about others’ perspectives, they may act without consideration as to how their actions can be interpreted by, or impact upon, others. Participants did not perceive their perspectives to be taken account of by home students, by parts of the university and by some people in the city and experienced a lack of scope and opportunities for meaningful social interaction with home students. This situation may represent a lost opportunity for the type of meaningful dialogue leading to the acquisition of nuanced perspectives about each other, and consequently about the wider world, enriched by diverse standpoints.

This suggests wider political consequences arising from international students’ social experiences of separation from the majority (home student) group. Arendt (1958) suggests that a healthy political and social environment depends upon the ability of people to be able to have dialogue with each other. We are living in a time where political debate is becoming polarised or even absent (Thompson, 2016), with people failing to participate in, and feeling disconnected from (Parvin, 2018) or ‘disenchanted’ (Stonebridge, 2024, p. 2) with political life. International students risk feeling disconnected from the majority group through perceived lack of opportunities
to encounter home students, despite their best efforts. I do not suggest that university staff try to ‘engineer’ the development of friendships in the social realm, as clearly the matter of who people choose to engage with in their own time, outside of formal institutional, educative spaces is a matter of personal choice. However, an educational setting is a space where students are a ‘captive audience’ (Biesta, 2016, p. 117), a space for more than just ‘the acquisition of knowledge and skills’ (Biesta, 2016, p. 118). It is a formal space of reflection and learning, part of which is about political existence, where we can learn to ‘bear with’ strangers (Arendt, 1994, p. 332). It is a space where we can encounter bodily, or ‘appear’ (Arendt, 1958) to each other. This suggests a role for educators to attend to how different cultural perspectives are enabled to enter the educative process, and how meaningful dialogue across these perspectives can happen, in a way that supports the development of mutual bodily orientation towards engagement.

Promoting educational practices that enhance opportunities for dialogue may enable the perspectives of both home and international doctoral students to become visible to each other and provide the forum for those perspectives to be reflected upon within a shared space.

Merleau-Ponty’s, Arendt’s and Ahmed’s work shed light upon social and embodied processes of exclusion and may be a fruitful starting point to think about how to develop meaningful practices to promote greater inclusion and enable the possibility for all students to encounter the world more objectively (Arendt, 1958) and promote greater capacity to participate in civic and political dialogue across difference. This means committing to reflecting upon the perspective of another to enlarge our perspectives upon the wider world.
Recommendations

1. Recognising that doctoral study has the potential to be an isolating experience, the doctoral curriculum could embed cross-disciplinary, face to face modules and seminars to engender academic opportunities for cross cultural contact with other students.

2. This research has shown a potential role for students' perceptions of campus buildings to have a role in the formation of academic and cultural identity. More research into how campus can impact, or construct identity is therefore recommended.

3. Students may use places on campus to mitigate the effects of cultural dislocation. Research with a wider population of international students could help develop understanding of how they do this.

4. This research has looked at experiences of campus from the perspective of international doctoral students, additional research from the perspective of home doctoral students may extend and contextualize this study's findings.

5. Doctoral supervisors attend to the material conditions of study, inquiring into students' on-the-ground experience of participation and comfort and seek solutions that recognise the particularity of students' needs.
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Appendix 1 - Invitation email

Dear All,

Are you an international student studying for a Doctorate or PhD?

I am doing a doctorate on how international doctoral students experience the Port City campus. I believe that the place where we study can make a difference to how we feel about ourselves and our work. I would like to invite you to participate in this project by agreeing to:

- take a walk around campus with me talking about what you think and feel about the Port City campus.
- Whilst we walk taking pictures on your phone of the campus
- Meeting with me after the walk to talk about the walk

I am hoping that we can use the findings to improve the international doctoral student experience at Port City.

I have attached an information sheet which gives you more detail about what it is I am trying to do and I hope that you will want to be part of it.

As a very small token of thanks, I will be offering you a £10 amazon voucher.

I appreciate how busy you all are and would be very grateful for your participation. If you would like to take part, please email me on anne.bentley@Port City.ac.uk

With very best wishes

Anne
Appendix 2 - Information Sheet for walking and face to face interviews

Title of Project: How does the Port City campus affect International doctoral students?

What is this project about?

The places where we live and study can make a difference to how we feel about ourselves and how we feel about the place we live in.

I would like us to take a walk around the campus and as we walk, for you to talk to me about what you think and feel about the Port City campus. I will record our conversations.

As we walk, I will ask you to take photos on your phone of things that interest you.

Afterwards I will ask you to choose 6 photos and email them to me.

About two weeks after the walk, we will meet for a face-to-face interview to discuss what the walk was like for you. I will bring along your photos and we can talk about these as well.

At this meeting I will give you a map of the campus and ask you to mark on the map, places that you go regularly. I will record this interview as well.

After the interview I will give you a £10 amazon voucher to thank you for taking part.
All of the recordings will be transcribed.

**Who will be researching the project?**

My name is Anne Bentley and this research is for a Doctorate in Education.

**How will you protect my confidentiality?**

I will take away anything in the transcript that contains your name and I will take away anything that could make people know that it was you in the research.

**Data Storage**

I will store recordings, photographs, any notes and transcripts of the recordings on a password protected computer and any printed copies of your photos will be stored on a locked filing cabinet. All information will be stored for ten years.

**What will you do with my information?**

I will think about what you have said in the interviews and will look at your photos. Then, as part of my Doctorate, I will write a paper about how some international students feel and think about the Port City campus. I will also write articles for academic and/or professional journals and present my work at conferences.

If you would like to see what I have written, please ask me. I would be very happy to share my work with you.

**Informed Consent and the Right to withdraw**
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My study is completely separate from your studies and taking part in this research will not affect your course.

It is up to you if you want to take part or not. If you say yes, it's ok if you then want to change your mind. You do not have to say anything you do not want to. You can leave the walking or face-to-face interview at any time without saying why and you can ask for the taping to be switched off at any time.

When I come to write the paper, I will take out your personal details so that readers will not know it was you. After doing this, I will not be able to take out what you have said. Therefore you have up to one month after the face to face interview to ask for your interviews to be taken out.

If you decide that you do not want to take part, please contact me Anne Bentley (anne.bentley@Port City.ac.uk).

What if I become upset as a result of talking in this interview or during my participation in the project?

At any point you are welcome to seek support. To do so, please contact the Student Wellbeing Services at studentcounselling@Port City.ac.uk. There is also a Mental Health Helpline, staffed 24/7, by counsellors from outside of the University who provide practical information, resources, counselling and web based support. Call them on Freephone (redacted) or email them at (redacted).

Feedback
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Please contact me at any time if you have any questions about this research.

If you agree to take part, please read the consent form. When you come to the interview, I will discuss the information sheet and consent form. If you agree, I will ask you to sign the consent form before we begin.

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

To speak to me please email anne.bentley@Port City.ac.uk

To speak to a counsellor, please contact studentcounselling@Port City.ac.uk.

For 24/7 telephone support please call the Mental Health Helpline on Freephone (redacted) or email them at (redacted).
# Appendix 3 - Chronological Overview of Data Generation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
<th>Step 1: Walking interview</th>
<th>Walking interview word count</th>
<th>Step 2: Walking Interview Duration (minutes and seconds)</th>
<th>Step 2: Date photos received</th>
<th>Step 3: Face to face interview</th>
<th>Face to face interview word count</th>
<th>Face to Face Interview Duration (minutes and Seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne (researcher)</td>
<td>Conducted with self as a ‘dry run’</td>
<td>6/7/18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40.07</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/12/18</td>
<td>5,740</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>10/12/18</td>
<td>20/12/18</td>
<td>4,893</td>
<td>44.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>17/12/18</td>
<td>5,637</td>
<td>52.41</td>
<td>17/1/19</td>
<td>4/2/19</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>61.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td></td>
<td>14/2/19</td>
<td>5,387</td>
<td>50.22</td>
<td>14/2/19</td>
<td>7/3/19</td>
<td>3,658</td>
<td>29.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td></td>
<td>27/2/19</td>
<td>8,142</td>
<td>55.08</td>
<td>5/3/19</td>
<td>21/3/19</td>
<td>5,656</td>
<td>38.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td></td>
<td>28/2/19</td>
<td>6,199</td>
<td>56.14</td>
<td>11/3/19</td>
<td>22/3/19</td>
<td>2,924</td>
<td>23.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/3/19</td>
<td>5,772</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>10/3/19</td>
<td>18/3/19</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>52.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/3/19</td>
<td>8,338</td>
<td>52.51</td>
<td>14/3/19</td>
<td>22/3/19</td>
<td>6,966</td>
<td>41.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13/3/19</th>
<th>14/3/19</th>
<th>25/3/19</th>
<th>Total Word count (pilot excluded)</th>
<th>419.44 mins = 6.99 hours</th>
<th>Total Times</th>
<th>331.96 mins = 5.53 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>4,073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 - Consent form

Title of Project: How does the Port City campus affect International doctoral students?

I have read and understand the information sheet. I have been able to ask questions and get answers to help me decide whether to take part.

I understand that it is up to me if I take part in the study or not. I understand that I can leave the study at any time without giving any reason.

I understand that the walking and face-to-face interviews will be taped and then transcribed.

I understand that Anne Bentley will take away anything in the transcript that contains my name and take away anything that could make people know that it was me in the research.
I understand that after the face to face interview, I have up to one month to ask for anything I have said to be withdrawn. After one month the researcher, Anne Bentley will not be able to withdraw anything I have said as she will have taken out anything that personally identifies me.

I understand that the study is part of a doctorate and may get written about in journals and may be presented at conferences

I consent to take part in this research under the terms outlined above ☐

Name of participant:

Signature:

Date:

CONTACT INFORMATION

If you have any questions or concerns please contact Anne Bentley,

anne.bentley@Port City.ac.uk
### Application for Ethical Approval of Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(For EdRESC use only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(expedited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High/ low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-if high refer to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UREC chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont. Review Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome (delete as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined/ Amend/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part A: PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Investigator *Note 1

Anne Bentley

If Student, please name your Director of Studies or Project Advisor: Norman Gabriel

Course/programme: Doctorate in Education

School/directorate (if not PloE):

Contact Address: Student Wellbeing Services,

Tel: 01752 587703 E mail: anne.bentley@Port City.ac.uk

2. Title of research: How does the Port City campus affect international doctoral students?

3. Nature of approval sought (Please tick relevant boxes) *Note 2

a) PROJECT: ☒ b) TAUGHT PROGRAMME (max. 3 years):

*If a,) please indicate which category:
Principal Investigators are responsible for ensuring that all staff employed on projects (including research assistants, technicians and clerical staff) act in accordance with the
University’s ethical principles, the design of the research described in this proposal and any conditions attached to its approval.

*2. In most cases, approval should be sought individually for each project. Programme approval is granted for research which comprises an ongoing set of studies or investigations utilising the same methods and methodology and where the precise number and timing of such studies cannot be specified in advance. Such approval is normally appropriate only for ongoing, and typically unfunded, scholarly research activity.

*3. If there is a difference in ethical standards between the University’s policy and those of the relevant professional body or research sponsor, Committees shall apply whichever is considered the highest standard of ethical practice.

*4. Approval is granted for the duration of projects or for a maximum of three years in the case of programmes. Further approval is necessary for any extension of programmes.
If you are staff, are there any other researchers involved in your project? Please list who they are, their roles on the project and if/how they are associated with the University. Please include their email addresses. (*Please indicate School of each named individual, including collaborators external to the Faculty/University):

If you are a student, who are your other supervisors?

HD (second supervisor)

Have you discussed all ethical aspects of your research with your Director of Studies prior to submitting this application? Yes ☒ No ☐

Type of application:

Initial application ☒

Resubmission with amendments ☐ Version Number:

Amendment to approved application * ☐

Renewal ☐

* For full details of the amendments procedure, please see the guidance notes

Summary of aims, objectives and methods (max 250 words)
This research will explore how the Port City campus impacts international doctoral students, focusing on the ‘campus-spaces’ that matter to them. In most research, campus features as an unseen, passive backdrop to students’ lives. This research foregrounds it, not only as a point of entry into figurative, embodied and emotional experience but also as an agentic, material entity that influences and shapes the lives of those who occupy it (Hopwood and Paulson, 2012).

Five participants will walk with me (separately) around the Port City campus, and talk about the places they interact with regularly (Appendix 3). Participants will direct the walk and take photographs of places that have meaning for them. After the walk, they will be asked to email me up to 6 photographs.

A fortnight later, participants will be invited to a face-to-face interview to reflect upon the walk and discuss their photographs. At this interview, participants will be given a map of the Port City campus (Appendix 4) and asked to mark the places where they habitually go to map their participation with the campus.

Walking and face-to-face interviews will be recorded and transcribed. The transcripts, photographs, maps and researcher’s field notes will form the data.

The data set will be analysed using an interpretive approach, guided by Van Manen’s (1990) four existential fundamentals: lived self-other relations; lived bodily connections to others; lived time and lived space. Using Heidegger’s ‘hermeneutic circle’, analysis will move from part to whole of the data and whole to part, iteratively, until rich, possibly hidden, aspects emerge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>When do you need/expect to begin the research methods for which ethical approval is sought?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How long will this research take and/or for how long are you applying for this ethical approval?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What will be the outcomes of this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no other research that explores campus as an active agent in the everyday lives of international doctoral students and whilst Port City-based, these findings will help universities to consider how campus may impact upon the social, personal and educational experience of international doctoral students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The wellbeing of postgraduate students is of current concern (Evans et al., 2018; Leveque et al., 2017). It is possible that this research may offer insights into how a campus may (both literally and figuratively) impact upon doctoral students' wellbeing and academic experience and inform measures to improve the quality of the international student doctoral experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Is the project subject to an <strong>external</strong> funding bid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bid amount:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bid status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>University Project Finance Team costing approved with Dean’s signature?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Has the funding bid undergone peer review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Partners &amp; Institutions:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part B: ETHICAL REVIEW STATEMENT

The purpose of this statement is to clarify whether the proposed research requires ethical clearance through an Ethics Protocol. Please read the relevant section of the guidance notes before you complete your statement.

Please indicate all the categories into which your proposed research fits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection / analysis involved:</th>
<th>Action required:</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 This study does not involve data collection from or about human participants.</td>
<td>➢ Complete this Ethical Review Statement and add a brief (one page) description of your research and intended data collection methods. Part C not required.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 This study involves the analysis or synthesis of data obtained from/about human subjects where such data are in the public domain (i.e. available in public archives and/or previously published)</td>
<td>➢ Complete this Ethical Review Statement and add a brief (one page) description of your research, the nature of the data and intended data collection methods. Part C not required.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 This study involves the analysis of data obtained from/about human participants where the data has been previously collected but is not in the public domain | ➢ Complete this Ethical Review Statement  
➢ Please complete Part C – Ethical Protocol | ☐ |
This study draws upon data already collected under a previous ethical review but involves utilising the data in ways not cleared with the research participants:

- Complete this Ethical Review Statement
- Please complete Part C – Ethical Protocol
- Submit copy of original ethics protocol and additional consent materials (if relevant) attached.

This study involves new data collection from/about human participants:

- Complete this Ethical Review Statement
- Please complete Part C – Ethical Protocol
- Submit copies of all information for participants AND consent forms in style and format appropriate to the participants together with your research instruments.

Please Note: Should the applicant wish to alter in any significant regard the nature of their research following ethical approval, an application for amendment should be submitted to the committee together with a covering letter setting out the reasons for the amendment. The application should be made with reference to one or more of the categories laid out in this document. ‘Significant’ should be interpreted as meaning changing in some fundamental way the research purposes and processes in whole or part.
Part C: ETHICS PROTOCOL

Please indicate how you will ensure that this research conforms to Port City University’s Research Ethics Policy - *The Integrity of Research involving Human Participants*. Please complete each section with a statement that addresses each of the ethical principles set out below. Please note that you should provide the degree of detail suggested. Each section will expand to accommodate this information.

*Please refer to Guidance Notes when completing this section.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Informed consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please attach copies of all draft information / documents, consent forms, questionnaires, interview schedules, etc intended for the participants, and list below. When it is not possible to submit research instruments (e.g. use of action research methods) the instruments should be listed together with the reason for the non-submission. Please also indicate the attachments in Question A7.

An information sheet (Appendix 1) detailing the research aims, methods and outcomes and an informed consent form (Appendix 2) will be supplied to students who respond positively to the invitation email sent to all international doctoral students.
I will assure all potential participants that their responses will be anonymised, coded and all personally identifiable details will be removed.

Interviews will be recorded and transcribed; this data will be stored in encrypted form using OneDrive as required by university guidelines. The data will be stored by Anne Bentley in password protected computers and access to data will not be given to other users. I will ensure that I explain this to participants, who are likely to have English as a second language, in clear and accessible language.

2 Openness and honesty

It is generally accepted that research with human participants would not involve deception. However if this is not the case, deception is permissible only where it can be shown that all three of the following conditions have been met in full.

1. Deception is completely unavoidable if the purpose of the research is to be achieved.
2. The research objective has strong scientific merit.
3. Any potential harm arising from the proposed deception can be effectively neutralised or reversed by the proposed debriefing procedures.

If deception is involved, applicants are required to provide a detailed justification and to supply the names of two independent assessors whom the
Committee can approach for advice. Please attach relevant documentation and list below.

Deception will not be used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th><strong>Right to withdraw</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please provide a clear statement regarding what information has been provided to participants regarding their right to withdraw from the research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see attached Information Sheet and Consent Agreement (Appendix 1 and Appendix 2) where the right to withdraw is clearly stated. Students will be informed about their right not to participate in the research. Non participation in this study will bear no penalty. During interviews, participants have the right not to answer specific questions and can stop the interview at any time.

Students’ participation in this research will be entirely voluntary and they have the right to withdraw from the study at any time before data analysis takes place without prejudice. This means that whether they decide to participate or not will have no bearing upon any academic work.

If they wish to withdraw, they should contact me, Anne Bentley (anne.bentley@Port City.ac.uk).
During the walking and face-to-face interviews, participants will have the right to request the audio recording to cease at any time and the right to leave at any time. Participants will have up to one month following the face-to-face interview to withdraw.

After data analysis, due to anonymisation of data for the purposes of data analysis, I will not be able to withdraw any contributions participants have made as it would be difficult to identify individual responses.

However, all participants will be ensured that their names, or any other information that may identify them, will not appear in the transcripts of the discussions or subsequent journal article.

The right to withdraw is stated on the consent forms. The right to withdraw will also be reiterated at the start of the walking and face-to-face interviews.

4 Protection from Harm

Indicate here any vulnerability that may be present because of the:

- participants e.g. children or vulnerable adults.
- nature of the research process.

If you tick any box below, please indicate in “further information” how you will ensure protection from harm.

Does this research involve:

| Children | ☐ |
Further information:

I will clearly outline and discuss the information sheet with participants to ensure that they are fully aware of what will be expected of them from participating in his research. Participants may disclose personal information and I will ensure that if this evokes distress, they are informed about the 24/7 Mental Health Line (Appendix 1) and the services of the Student Wellbeing Services.

I will ensure that participants are aware and have understood their right to withdraw at any time (see Appendix 1 and 2).

When conducting walking interviews, I will ensure that the interview is confined to university sites. For face-to-face interviews, dates and times will be arranged so that staff are present in the building. The walking and face-to-face interviews will take place during working hours.
Protecting the welfare of participants requires culturally sensitive attention, requiring me to reflect and think about upon what other cultures perceive as respectful behaviour. This may be reflected in aspects such as eye contact and clothing, for example as a female researcher it may be appropriate when working with students from Islamic countries to dress in clothing that suitably covers shoulders, arms and legs. Equally when working with Japanese participants it is important to be aware that direct eye contact is often considered disrespectful and rude.

Whilst arranging the walking interviews, I will ensure that I ascertain information about the country students have travelled from and ensure that I am informed about some of the potential cultural characteristics such as social structures, customs and communication styles and cultural values prior to meeting them for the walking interview. Equally I will respect participants as individuals and guard against relying upon generalisations about other cultures, using my information as a tentative guide and not a blueprint.

I am a white researcher and acknowledge the multiple privileges afforded to me as a white, English-speaking, researcher. I possess structural privileges arising from my nationality, cultural history (past colonial power) and language. I am aware that my racial identity and history could impact upon the research process. I am aware that ‘whiteness’ has the power to structure and dominate available discourses, cultural practices and behaviours and that it has the capacity to exclude non-white dimensions such non-white historical and non-white socio-political perspectives. Whiteness being embedded as a cultural norm, could affect the way I hear what participants say and how I
report it. It is therefore profoundly important that I monitor myself and guard against interpreting what participants say to me through a ‘white’, ethnocentric perspective which disempowers my participants.

I am also aware that my gender and age may impact on the way that some students engage in the research process. It is likely of course that every participant will have inherited cultural assumptions and norms concerning how gender and age are understood and related to, and it will be very important that I have awareness of where these may be impacting the participants’ experience of the research process. Again, while I would not wish to rely on generalizations about how different cultural or religious influences may affect the participants’ experience of working with me, I would expect to have made myself aware of values current in the participants’ culture regarding age and gender, and to use this awareness to inform my relating to participants, to ensure that the experience is not difficult or uncomfortable for them.

Political factors may influence participation, as students from countries with controlling bureaucracies may feel inhibited about expressing views that are critical either of their home or host country. I may need to reassure participants that it is valid, safe, confidential and acceptable to express negative or constructive things, as I am aware that participants from some cultures may feel inhibited from giving candid responses either towards or about ‘authority figures’ for fear of causing offense or showing disrespect.
To address this I will take special care to emphasise confidentiality and explain the anonymising procedures I will take in respect of what participants say to me. I will explain how the research will be used to deepen our understanding of how a place can impact and influence the people living within it and that it does not seek to personally expose individuals or report back what is said to political or other authority figures.

I am aware that fluency and competence with the English language may vary among international students and that there may be communication issues around comprehension, speaking skills and global variations in the use of English, for example a student taught American English may be unfamiliar with British terms and idioms. These ‘language barriers’ have the potential for miscommunication and misunderstanding on the part of both researcher and participants. I will take care over the language I use and guard against using jargon, slang or over-complicated phrases. I will strive to create a research-relationship of respect and valuing and I will use the interview skills of repeating back what the participants says to me to check that I have heard what they were saying and to give them a chance to reframe, confirm or challenge my understanding. My professional counselling skills will be an asset in this regard. I have also had previous experience of working with students who have benefitted from using translation tools and devices to help communicate more precisely what they wished to say, and would welcome any participant using such a tool if they found it helpful.

40% of University of Port City international doctoral students defined themselves as white and therefore given that non-white students form the
majority, I expect that non-white students will participate in my research. Port City has been described as one of the most homogenous areas in England (Burnett, 2011) with 96.2% of the Port City population being white (Census, 2011). In 2016, 59.9% of voters in Port City voted to leave the European Union (BBC) and since the Brexit vote, reports of hate crime in Port City have doubled (Eve, 2017). Given this, I am aware that non-white international students, form a minority in an overwhelmingly white city and white campus. I will be alert to any risk or signs of harassment. My research seeks to offer a supportive, safe space to talk about and acknowledge experiences of discrimination or racism. I will be alert to any possible safeguarding issues in terms of reports of harm or abuse (either by the participant or towards the participant) and encourage and support any participants affected by these issues to seek support and advice. My professional role as Wellbeing Services Manager makes me well-placed to facilitate such wellbeing support for participants where appropriate. Equally some international students may be feeling culturally and emotionally isolated in the UK and participating in the research could bring these feelings to the surface. Prior to participating, I will ensure that I am aware of the social opportunities available for international students such as the Global Buddies Group, the Languages Café, the student-led societies and the activities run by the International Student Advice Service. Where appropriate I will share this information with participants.

How will you choose your five students to ensure they represent diversity amongst international students?
The University of Port City has international doctoral students from over 44 countries (Information Services data, 2018). Given this, a sample of five will inevitably not reflect the full diversity of the international doctoral student population.

The sample size in my research is small and the number of cultures at University of Port City is great and diverse. People vary in many ways including ethnicity, gender, disability, age, and sexual orientation, they also vary in their class, urban or rural status. I accept that as a qualitative researcher with such a small sample size that I will not be able to reflect such diversity.

I aim to achieve a sample that seeks to illuminate how place has impacted and influenced the individual participant’s life. My research is idiographic in approach, focusing on the individual experience. I seek to explore the nuanced, lived experience of particular people, rather than to develop explanatory models applicable across different cultures and populations.

I will be sensitive in describing and exploring differences in experience across informants, my data analysis will move iteratively and dynamically between the whole and the parts. I will seek participants from a variety of countries to enable me to gather richly varied data. I will be paying close attention to differences in history, culture, immigration experiences, race, language and academic experience and will not be attempting to make claims about generalisability across all international doctoral students.
Do ALL researchers in contact with children and vulnerable adults have current DBS clearance?

Yes: ☐  No: ☐  N/A: ☒

If Yes, Please give disclosure number(s)

Name  Number

If No, please explain:

5  External Clearance

I undertake to obtain written permission from the Head of any external institutions (school, social service, prison, etc) in which research will be conducted. (please check box)

6  Participant/Subject Involvement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has this group of participants/subjects already been the subject of research in the current academic year?</td>
<td>Yes ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Payment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide details of any payments, either financial or in kind, made to participants for participation, compensation for time given, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will give each participant a £10 amazon voucher as a token of appreciation for their participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debriefing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide a clear statement regarding debriefing of participants following their involvement in the study. This should include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• when debriefing will take place,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• who will debrief the participants,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• how the debriefing will take place, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• what information has been provided to participants regarding debriefing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants will be given an information sheet (Appendix 1) to explain the aims, methods and reasons for the research. Participants will be briefed about their rights by the researcher prior to participating in the research. During this briefing, permission will be sought to audio record the walking and face-to-face interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants will be provided with a summary of the research findings on their request.

If participants become distressed, the researcher will ensure that participants are fully aware of the services of student wellbeing services and of the Mental Health Help Line. The researcher will ensure if necessary, that participants are aware of how to refer themselves to these services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>Dissemination of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Please provide a clear statement regarding what information has been provided to participants regarding dissemination of this research.*

Please see Consent Agreement attached (Appendix 2). Participants will be made aware that the results of the study may be published in the academic and professional literature after the project is complete and may be publicised through conferences.

I will explain to participants that I hope to publish the work in education-related journals and present the work via conference presentations.
I will inform them that if they wish, I would be very happy to supply them with any published outputs from this research or power point slides from any conference presentations.

10 **Confidentiality**

*Please provide a clear statement regarding what information has been provided to participants regarding confidentiality issues.*

This is clearly stated on the Consent Agreement (Appendix 2).


I will explain that the interviews will be transcribed and any personally identifying information will be removed from the transcript. This ensures that their personal information will be confidential and that they will not be identifiable.

11 **Ethical principles of professional bodies**

*Where relevant professional bodies have published their own guidelines and principles, these must be followed and the current University principles interpreted and extended as necessary in this context. Please state which (if any) professional bodies’ guidelines are being utilised.*
Declarations:

For all applicants, your signature below indicates that, to the best of your knowledge and belief, this research conforms to the ethical principles laid down by Port City University and by the professional body specified in C.11 above.

For supervisors of PGR students:

As Director of Studies, your signature confirms that you believe this project is methodologically sound and conforms to university ethical procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name(s)</th>
<th>Signature (electronic is acceptable)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Anne Bentley</td>
<td>Anne Bentley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff investigators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Studies (if applicant is a postgraduate research student):</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>03/07/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completed Forms should be forwarded by email to Faculty Research Ethics Administrator (artsresearchethics@Port City.ac.uk).

Meetings dates are published on the intranet (Information for the Education Research Ethics Sub-Committee). In order to be considered at the next available meeting, applications must be received no later than the last day of the preceding month.

You will receive approval and/or feedback on your application within 2 weeks of the meeting date at which the committee discussed this application.
Appendix 1 Ethics Information Sheet for walking and face to face interviews

Title of Project: How does the Port City campus affect International doctoral students?

What is this project about?

The places where we live and study can make a difference to how we feel about ourselves and how we feel about the place we live in.

I would like us to take a walk around the campus and as we walk, for you to talk to me about what you think and feel about the Port City campus. I will record our conversations.

As we walk, I will ask you to take photos on your phone of things that interest you. Afterwards I will ask you to choose 6 photos and email them to me.

About two weeks after the walk, we will meet for a face-to-face interview to discuss what the walk was like for you. I will bring along your photos and we can talk about these as well.
At this meeting I will give you a map of the campus and ask you to mark on the map, places that you go regularly. I will record this interview as well.

After the interview I will give you a £10 amazon voucher to thank you for taking part.

All of the recordings will be transcribed.

**Who will be researching the project?**

My name is Anne Bentley and this research is for a Doctorate in Education.

**How will you protect my confidentiality?**

I will take away anything in the transcript that contains your name and I will take away anything that could make people know that it was you in the research.

**Data Storage**
I will store recordings, photographs, any notes and transcripts of the recordings on a password protected computer and any printed copies of your photos will be stored on a locked filing cabinet. All information will be stored for ten years.

**What will you do with my information?**

I will think about what you have said in the interviews and will look at your photos. Then, as part of my Doctorate, I will write a paper about how some international students feel and think about the Port City campus. I will also write articles for academic and/or professional journals and present my work at conferences.

If you would like to see what I have written, please ask me. I would be very happy to share my work with you.

**Informed Consent and the Right to withdraw**

My study is completely separate from your studies and taking part in this research will not affect your course.
It is up to you if you want to take part or not. If you say yes, it’s ok if you then want to change your mind. You do not have to say anything you do not want to. You can leave the walking or face-to-face interview at any time without saying why and you can ask for the taping to be switched off at any time.

When I come to write the paper I will take out your personal details so that readers will not know it was you. After doing this, I will not be able to take out what you have said. Therefore you have up to one month after the face to face interview to ask for your interviews to be taken out.

If you decide that you do not want to take part, please contact me Anne Bentley (anne.bentley@Port City.ac.uk).

**What if I become upset as a result of talking in this interview or during my participation in the project?**

At any point you are welcome to seek support. To do so, please contact the student wellbeing services at studentcounselling@Port City.ac.uk. There is also an Mental Health Helpline, staffed 24/7, by counsellors from outside of the University who provide practical information, resources, counselling and web based support. Call them on Freephone (redacted) or email them at (redacted).

**Feedback**
Please contact me at any time if you have any questions about this research.

If you agree to take part, please read the consent form. When you come to the interview, I will discuss the information sheet and consent form. If you agree, I will ask you to sign the consent form before we begin.

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

To speak to me please email anne.bentley@Port City.ac.uk

To speak to a counsellor, please contact studentcounselling@Port City.ac.uk.

For 24/7 telephone support please call the Anytime Advice and Mental Health Helpline on Freephone (redacted) or email them at (redacted).
Appendix 2 Participant Consent Agreement for international doctoral students

Title of Project: How does the Port City campus affect International doctoral students?

I have read and understand the information sheet. I have been able to ask questions and get answers to help me decide whether to take part.

I understand that it is up to me if I take part in the study or not. I understand that I can leave the study at any time without giving any reason.

I understand that the walking and face-to-face interviews will be taped and then transcribed.

I understand that Anne Bentley will take away anything in the transcript that contains my name and take away anything that could make people know that it was me in the research.

I understand that after the face to face interview, I have up to one month to ask for anything I have said to be withdrawn. After one month the researcher, Anne Bentley will not be able to withdraw anything I have said as she will have taken out anything that personally identifies me.

I understand that the study is part of a doctorate and may get written about in journals and may be presented at conferences.
I consent to take part in this research under the terms outlined above ☐

Name of participant:

Signature:

Date:

CONTACT INFORMATION

If you have any questions or concerns please contact Anne Bentley,
anne.bentley@Port City.ac.uk
Appendix 3

Guiding questions for the walking interview around campus

The walk around campus will involve minimal questioning designed simply to maintain the momentum in a narrative about the interviewee’s experiences of the place, confining questions to prompts based on things mentioned in the interview (Evans and Jones, 2011, p.851)

The aim of this minimal questioning approach is to give participants space and opportunity to talk about their relationship with the campus.

As such the questions will be open and feature more as prompts. The following types of open questions or prompts will be used:

- Please feel free to comment about anything that comes to mind as we walk around campus together.
- Do you ever walk around campus?
- Can you tell me about your feelings about this place?
- What do you think about when you are walking here?
- Has anything changed about what you think and feel about this place?
Mainly I will reflect back participants’ words back to them as a means of inviting them to unpack their thoughts.


**Appendix 4**

Campus Map (REDACTED FOR CONFIDENTIALITY)

Please mark on this map below the places and spaces you regularly use or go to.

Please note participants will be given an *upscaled, larger copy* of this map.
31 October 2018

CONFIDENTIAL

Anne Bentley
Student Wellbeing Services
Learning Gateway
Wellbeing Centre

Dear Anne

Application for Approval by Education Research Ethics Sub-committee

Reference Number: 17/18-229

Application Title: How does the Plymouth campus affect international doctoral students?

I am pleased to inform you that the Education Research Ethics Sub-committee has granted approval to you to conduct this research.

Please note that this approval is for three years, after which you will be required to seek extension of existing approval.

Please note that should any MAJOR changes to your research design occur which effect the ethics of procedures involved you must inform the Committee. Please contact Claire Butcher on (01752) 585337 or by email claire.butcher@plymouth.ac.uk
Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Professor Jocey Quinn

Chair, Education Research Ethics Sub-committee -

Plymouth Institute of Education

Faculty of Arts and Humanities
Confidential

Ms Anne Bentley

Dear Ms Anne Bentley

Research Ethics Application Approval - Faculty Research Ethics and Integrity Committee:

3096

How does the Plymouth campus affect international doctoral students?

Thank you for uploading your application onto the new online system. I understand that it has all been reviewed before and we are only looking to provide an extension to the original end date which I have now done.

Please note that if you wish to make any minor changes to your research, you must complete an amendment form or major changes you will need to resubmit an application.

I wish you every success as you continue with your research.

Yours sincerely

Dr Verity Campbell Barr

Chair, Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Business - Education Research Ethics and Integrity Committee
Appendix 8- Commentary about walking interview 1
(with James)

His words are in italics

p.1 The first thing I note is that James focuses on activities associated with campus, rather than place per se.

the football pitch, so like you know the football ground, it’s 70 metre, or 100 metres, so I just do one lap it’s complete, then two, three up to 10, so when I finish 10 then I can just go home and take a shower, relax, cup of tea, coffee.

p.2 When asked about the campus, James responds in terms of the learning, i.e. that it is a beautiful space for learning, the space facilitates his need. He uses enthusiastic, positive language.

So tell me, what did you think of the campus when you first came here?

Port City University campus looks beautiful, nice yeah.

Really, what’s beautiful about it?
Yeah it’s exciting environment for learning, you can see this situation on a hill, mountain-like, which is an environment I most like myself to use for learning, a lot of facilities, I can see my lab, cos I’m doing ‘computer science engineering’, which good computer lab, and S building before moving to PS, but we moved this year, around February, so before moving our lab was still there, which is good facilities, computers, all facilities student needs to use. Yeah go to very, very nice university.

The meaning he is making is that the environment is relevant in so far as it facilitates his learning. Nearly all his comments about campus related to how it facilitates his academic progress. He uses aesthetic words such as ‘beautiful’; ‘nice’ to describe his learning. Talks about fresh air and being close to the sea but all this is about how they are good for learning,

p.2 there’s fresh air coming, yeah there’s fresh air coming, and we’re close to the sea, so this fresh air coming I think is very, very good when learning

His sense of the campus related to how it enables him to do the work he wants to do, it is not sensory, not about a sense of place, it is about how it helps him work.

The Library,

p.3 It’s very, very good, I never saw such kind of wonderful library.

The Library is wonderful because of the academic functions it facilitates for him i.e. it enables him to do conferences with international colleagues.

I notice when reading that I keep trying to take him away from the use he is making of campus to focusing on the environment itself (p.4) but this clearly does not have
resonance for him. I need to ask myself what I was trying to do here, what I was trying to ‘get at’ and why I found it harder to stay with him describing how he uses buildings.

p.5 he talks about the western architecture, the newness of the buildings – the buildings related to his task,

Yeah the newness, the appearance, the structure, the appearance of the environment, you feel it, oh I’m studying at university.

And very quickly he associates his talk about structure to how he used the building

Yeah I was there, the ones who help me to extend my visa, so they did everything, I think they’re very, very helpful, this one of the best also international office I’ve ever seen. P.6

p.7 James talks about x building in terms of the teacher training workshops he attended – he associates place with the activities of learning and teaching he experienced in them – I notice that things have value in that they contribute to developing his teaching and learning

p.9 I feel like even my blood now is into academia, my blood is into it, I can’t go anywhere, I can’t go to work in the industry.

so this is all academia, academia, academia, academia.
He talks about utilisation of space in terms of its use rather than meaning – what is meaningful is how space and place is used rather than the sensory experience of place. Although his language is very beautiful.

p.10 the weather is relevant in so far as it facilitates activity

Yeah the weather doesn’t stop me doing things

So if you’re used to that kind of weather, this country’s taught me coming to university do my daily life activities, do my normal work.

p.11 He does not see the uni as a social environment, it is a place to meet family and then go off campus on an outing, a place to meet and drive off from.

GP- describes campus in terms of places he has used –has used all of the campus, conveying to me his sense of ownership pf and familiarity with campus

Yeah, I have been using other parts of the campus, especially the university library, yeah have used this building, almost every building I’d say I have touched it, I have went into and I use, and to this building

The word ‘touched’ is interesting, a bodily world, he makes contact and then moves on

p.12 James has noticed increased diversity on campus and in Port City – what matters to him about this is how the university is integrated into the international world – what is valuable for him is how the university facilitates the academic work which for him is about being able to link in with other people in different physical locations.
The extent to which the university is integrated internationally matters to him but it is about how it is integrated into a world that is beyond the physical boundaries of the campus or of other physical locations – he is concerned about an international community that transcends the physical place.

Being physically located in a specific place is less important than the degree to which the university can enable connections with others internationally beyond the place – engagement isn’t with the place

*p.15 university now is all universal over the world*

But he says that this requires a mindset of living beyond the local and this is derived from study abroad, the international academic mindset is fostered by having international students at university – universities are made more valuable by looking outwards and by making connections with international students. Globalised universities produce students who are more acceptable to the market.

He sees research is an international exercise that raises a university’s achievement in a particular place.

*p.17 he describes a sense of self as*

so kind of going coming, yes coming going, it’s coming going.

belonging somewhere but then going out, belonging, going out. But I think my final destination I’ll go back home

His identity is as an academic – campus exists to serve his academic growth. Everywhere is coming, going, because the final destination is going home.
Appendix 9 - What is place? Quotes from students

Steve

1. so we just buy some burger, and there are some English people there and the man just cook the burger for us and he gave the burger to us, and then the man just said why do you give the burger to Chink before us.

2. I just walk back from the campus to my home ............... Then I found about eight or nine, or 10, many people there.......... So one of them, I think it’s a British, I think he’s very young, so he just shouted at my ear from many close by, and he just shouted at me, wow, very loud. So I was just scared and I say what, and it seems he’s drunk, and he said what and then he punched me just here ................. My eye, so it really hurt, I just at time I’m blind you know, I don’t know if it works or not ..... at the time I just feel helpless you know.

3. So one my supervisor I just shared my experience to her, because she is Korean and she said she also have the similar experience in Glasgow 20 years or 30 years, she says you can’t, you have to meet these things, and the best way is that, you can’t change their mind so if they do something rude to you, you just ignore them, so it will keep you safe. If you try to fight, because they are local so you will be dangerous.

4. I’m new here. So I’ve never been there, so this place I think because this is for art ..... they work with passion I think. ............... They’re very passionate about yeah ............... Their clothes and their hair, and very passionate I think. ............... Different colours I think, from this building.

5. I know many of the foreign, people from other countries, from Germany and from other countries, we meet together and after the party, we may go to the pub and chat with each other ............... we want to know some British guy, we want to know the culture here.... British students they have their own group, so because their own English is really quite good and they have a friend before. I can understand that because when I was in China, as a Chinese when I was in China, so I have my own Chinese friends, we play together because we have similar viewpoints about the world, about the things, and we can play the things all we like.
James

1. Port City University campus looks beautiful......almost every building I’d say I have touched it, ...........Yeah the newness, the appearance, the structure, the appearance of the environment, you feel it, oh I’m studying at university.

2. Place is in my blood, my blood is in place, my blood is everywhere I can study

3. I feel like even my blood now is into academia, my blood is into it

4. most of my time is spent on campus, yeah if you find me off campus then I’m at home or in town, that's 15%, or 10%, but most of the time since when I started my PhD I'm on campus. ......my main life has been on campus.

5. the first in every university to be respected is the university library. That is where everything is made, that's where innovation comes from, .... So any new ideas it's coming from the library; classes you learn but at the end of the day you need to go to the library, .... if you want to get knowledge, that's why there's every book, everything for student. So it's really, really important place, you can't find books in classes, no it's in the university, so they need to go there.

6. I think see myself walking on three different lands, one is Dar es Salaam, second land I’m walking on is China, and the third land I’m walking on is UK or Europe... I know really where I’m going.

7. But what I would like more maybe is to increase the number of international students, that's really important international-wise, if you want to compete international-wise I think integrating, those different minds, inviting bright people here to do you raise the university standard.

Tina

1. And then I met a lot of new friends and we went around, we went on trips and all......... I kind of had a variety of friends, a couple of them were from engineering, and mechanics, and robotics and stuff.... most of them are
international students, so around four of them are like students from India, culture-wise we are different but we are really close in the map. So it’s really nice, I think what I really admire about it is that the friendship in the people that I’ve met throughout my study and everything ….. you would just know them and when you see them you can actually have a conversation with them, it’s very nice.

2. after the lectures everyone would go there just to like gather and just have a pint and talk over things, and most of the time cultural perspectives of things, because we had like a diverse classroom, there were European students and then Asian student, and different parts of Asia as well, and then me from Sri Lanka, and then a couple of African continent students, so we had a very diverse classroom, so we would go there and just discuss about little things,

3. the postgraduate room upstairs on that floor is very silent, and my work study hours are really different from like the normal student study hours, like I study in the night so I would go to the library at like 7pm or 9pm maybe, and then I would stay until the morning. What I do is I pack everything that I need during that time and then I would go in the night, so I would stay in the library until maybe like 6am or 7am or something….. So at night I think because everyone’s asleep you don’t really have anyone to talk to at that moment so you can do work, so I think that’s why it works for me

Sarah

1. Sometimes because my partner’s white, we do get people asking us are you an import bride. So it’s funny things like that,……. if all you know is a certain way of seeing somebody it’s really hard to break out of there unless you’re willing to do it. I think it’s uncomfortable for a lot of people, and you can’t really blame them cos life is a lot easier if you can put things into boxes, ………….. but I’m just used to it cos people say weird things to me on buses as well….. like ah you steal our jobs and stuff but they don’t understand,

2. So when I was in the supermarket with my partner we met a guy who spoke to him only and asked how he got me a visa, so I got my own visa, but it’s one of those weird stuff, people are weird sometimes.

3. But you also get people who are really rude and think you’re a cleaner and therefore, you don’t understand English, or there’s different layers of weirdness, I’m a student as well, we’re all students, it’s bizarre though………. I know I’m a cleaner who’s Asian but it’s doesn’t mean I can’t speak English,
Hannah

1. in Saudi Arabia they’re more focused on the teaching, and the students are busy with their courses, .... we try to open a club or doing something like that, but ...... students, they are not interested...... I’m thinking because of their courses and it’s heavy on them, and they teach them in English ............ my daughters are at the Art school, it is different so they focus on their work and project, and doing art and these things, and I found my daughter she’s very good at these things, and instead of just staying and hear what the teacher says, maybe of the way of teaching.

2. sometimes when I do the working and a lot of pressure on this one, and a lot of feedback comment, and then I have to do these and these, and I’m confusing about these things..... the PhD it never stops

3. I like this building because of the architecture and the way of they design the building and the windows, ....... they have all this window they can have a good view, or they can see the sun or anything outside happening, it will affect them and their personality maybe and be more productive, this is what I feel about this one. .............even you don’t smell the fresh air but you can feel it when you see it through the window you can feel it. So this is what I like about this building, the way they design it.

4. you want to become friends with them and work with them, I couldn’t find any.... the time, this is my problem, I usually go to the time, this is my problem..... on the PhD you don’t talk a lot with people, you just work on your own,

5. I told them if somebody need to learn Arabic I can teach them and he will teach me English instead; they told me they were going to see but they couldn’t find anyone, because everyone I think is busy.

Phil

1. some of them they prefer not to interact or communicate with any question, or sometimes they don’t even say hi or hello, nothing at all............. I think nothing is personal ... because it wasn’t only with me, it was with other PhD students, even with other staff. .... I don’t think there is anything in particular I
can say is the reason other than personal, personality and the opportunity, they prefer to ….. not interact with anyone.

2. Yeah, I contact the school and asked them for a space and they said sorry we don’t have a space, they kept saying I can use the space in z building, it’s hot desk you can use it. But I was thinking that’s not the point, I came here to Port City University, I came here to meet other staff, other professionals, to learn from them, I can do the same at home … So they didn’t offer me, I tried to go and find space myself, and I found a space, .. I mean they didn’t even contact me or tell me about a space in there, I kept going every week or two weeks there after I found my own space, and there they didn’t know I was there at all.

3. when I was alone I didn’t know where I am going, am I on the right track, my supervisor was happy about my progress but I’m still like am I doing well or not?

4. I noticed that engaging with other international students is much easier than engaging with British students, ….. and if we are working in the same area sometimes they don’t even say anything like hi or hello, nothing at all, I think even in British culture’s it’s okay to say, hi, hello and good morning…… In other cultures quite seem weird if you see someone every day, you work in the same area, you don’t say hi or hello it’s quite strange. This just about saying hi and hello, things simple like this, sometimes I don’t even know how they’re doing, or what are they teaching, nothing at all because I don’t see any kind of communication with them. So it’s much easier to communicate with other international students,

Linda

1. Actually this year in my faculty, or even our department, is only me is Asian, so sometimes others speak very fast so it’s difficult for me to follow, ….. but now I study art, so a little bit different, the method is different, so I need to know the history, and the art history, and the philosophy, but you know the philosophy is totally different from my country and the Western country, and some famous philosophers I don’t know them …… my classmate will talk about the philosopher and the words of the history of art, but from my cultural background, it’s quite difficult to understand and sometimes I think maybe if I can speak fluent English then I can introduce more from my culture background, the aesthetic culture, and the philosophy.
2. It’s very clean university here, all really clean, and this is morning and in the afternoon I went to the seaside, it’s really nice, it’s also very clean, and it didn’t have smell……. I just found the other side of the L building they have some flowers, it smells really nice, especially in the night, sometimes I walk late and in that road it has really a good smell….. Yeah it’s really nice, and also the flowers and the smells, and also they tell me it’s spring.

3. Due to in our culture we share the room in the accommodation, really for six people in the one room,… But here we can do anything due to we have our own room, so that’s quite different….. but in our culture we stay in the university accommodation so university will control us, will protect us, or anything, we can’t away after 11 o’clock at night, we need to be back to campus before that time. But it seems in Britain it’s quite a freedom, they have a lot of freedom, so almost every week my roommates will have a party, they will enjoy life.

4. It’s quiet and especially for international students, sometimes we need to talk to other people, we don’t want to be alien….. the first week I’m here I really was shocked, the class I’m the only Asian, even down in the cafe there is only European people and we’re all like international students, and I go to our office and I’m the only international, and in my house it is only me, …….. so I’m totally alone in the British culture so it’s quite a shock,

Deborah

1. A Soviet bloc because of the concrete…. very concrete campus…. up here, you can see all the old buildings, very plain cement structures, yeah it just kind of blocks the sky and you don’t see anything green, it’s just paved over everywhere here on campus, there’s not really any green on campus,

2. Dangling over the sea…. I just complain the whole way up, like why do I do this to myself, I don’t know why I do it. …. It makes me feel alive a little bit, I think it’s almost like a meditative process cos you’ve got to really focus on what you’re doing and always prepare in advance for everything, so you’re always cleaning the rope way, hooking up all your gear on your rack the right way, and just preparing for the worst essentially.

3. I just put on my headphones and get in the zone, don’t really have to think about anything, it’s like cooking or something, just kind of do it.
4. Yeah it's nice to be able to … see the weather coming in and stuff… I'll often rush down and get a coffee and sit here on the stairs.
Appendix 10: The Educational Dream

Working with the data – thinking about the significance of being at Port City University

The Educational Dream – Later to feed into the theme of Extend.

Key concepts are The Educational Dream and Emplacement

The concepts of the educational dream and emplacement both emerge from the intentionality the students have about studying at Port City and are both aspects of the students' experiencing of campus.

Intentionality:

Consciousness is always of something, 'for.. phenomenologists 'intentionality' is the generic term for this pointing-beyond-itself proper to consciousness..' (Zahavi, p16).

In studying the students' experience of campus I, 'do not focus on the object [ie, campus] precisely as given, but also.. on...[the] subjective accomplishments and... intentionality that is at play for the object to appear as it does.' (Zahavi, p27).

This involves considering the 'structure of the object-experience' (p.27). In paying attention to intentionality, I have identified that part of the students' intentionality in their experience of the campus, the structure of this experience, involves their aspirations and wishes about their involvement in the campus and its activities.
(pedagogical and otherwise) and also the meanings they make about this, including how their involvement with the physical, material campus does or does not support them in making their wishes actual and tangible, in their daily experience of life at Port City.

**The Educational Dream** structures the students’ experience of studying at Port City, it involves their hopes and ambitions for their period of study, the feelings and expectations they have about coming to study here, also about what they encounter on campus, and the meanings they make of these. For most, the educational dream is intertwined with a sense of different possibilities than those offered from within their own culture. The educational dream encapsulates the academic potential offered by doctoral study in another country and is manifest in the pedagogic atmosphere evoked in the narratives. It reflects something new, something self-developing, self-confirming and self-expanding.

For most, the educational dream is intertwined with a sense of different possibilities than those offered from within their own culture. The educational dream encapsulates the academic potential offered by doctoral study in another country and is manifest in the pedagogic atmosphere evoked in the narratives. It reflects at best something new, something self-developing, self-confirming and self-expanding, although two of the students seemed not to have educational dreams for themselves. For one, her educational dream seemed to be for her children, and the other seemed not to have such a dream at all.

The educational dream is characterised by potency, affect and intentionality. It involves a perception of 'becoming something' (either for the student themselves, or
for others they have a dream for). The potency of the dream lies in the extent to which they experience this development, this moving towards something, as possible, meaningful and becoming actual through their pedagogic experience at Port City (or at her childrens' school in Port City for one of the students). It will be seen below that the potency of these educational dreams do not just involve academic achievement, the 'becoming something' they are seeking, is bound up with the meanings they make about the process of working towards their PhD, as well as the eventual (hoped for) award of the degree.

The educational dream is also sustained by a strong emotional charge that impacts their experience of the campus: the intensity and nature of this emotional charge is the 'affect' of the dream.

The dream also has an aspect of intentionality, of orientation towards an outcome. There is a sense that intentionality, as applied to this group of students, is about a specific personal trajectory out into the world. Their doctoral study has triggered a process of continuing evolution, intentionality as orientation towards academic and personal growth.

Educational Dream = Potency + Affect + Intentionality

The educational dream (a figural concept) impacts and imbues their experience of the materiality of the campus and the campus has a role in sustaining the educational dream. The educational dream influences their orientation to campus.

The potency of becoming
Seven of the eight students have an ‘educational dream’ that sustains and inspires them. One has not and I suggest that her lack of dream also influences and shapes her experience of campus. The lack seems to reinforce the importance of the educational dream as a central sustaining concept. As the educational dream is a pervading concept, I draw out its features in each of the students.

**Steve**

**Potency: becoming a man**

For Steve the dream is about being able to think for himself, to individuate from his parents and culture, become self-directed and develop agency and skills to think for himself in the world.

‘In China, as a student the parents will give you all the things so it will not help you to just deal with the problems, but if you meet some other problems you can’t deal with, you must ask your parents. But if you study here you will be, how to say, you can be a man I think yeah’.

He equates his newly acquired academic skills of logic and thinking and the experience of studying in Port City with helping him to move into adulthood,

‘So I think more logical, I can think more, and I really think I’m a man’.

**Affect: freedom being open to difference**

He compares Port City to where he has come from, noting that his university in China was enclosed by a wall isolating the university from the wider environment, with access only for ‘authorised’ people. He says that in China the students’ focus is condensed upon their studies and feels that the open nature of the Port City campus
means that 'the strangers may come in'. Whilst he does not reflect upon his feelings about this, he directly goes to say that this sense of openness enables people inside the campus to, 'do what they're interested in, apart from the work'. He experiences the university as a place which, unlike his university in China, is open to different kinds of personal growth, not just academic growth.

The possibilities afforded by the campus offers new freedoms that are culturally enlarging,

‘we can learn new things, the cultural, we can feel a different culture’.

He contrasts the Port City and China campuses and reflects upon how exposure to the Port City campus may benefit him academically and personally to think for himself and to do what interests him outside of study. Both of these aspects are new to him.

**Intentionality: towards personal maturation**

**James**

**Potency: becoming an academic leader, an agent of global change.**

His dream is of becoming an international leader, a change agent. He sees a university as a site for growing academic leaders who can solve society’s problems. Intrinsic to his dream is a dream of return to Africa, with expertise gathered from his years of international study, to

‘establish my own research centre actually back home, help maybe other students from Africa, or from this world, to do research together, the edge-cutting research, which can solve maybe society problems, that’s what I see for myself, that’s what I intend to do in the future’.
He describes the felt impact of his educative journey which has included Africa, China and Britain as,

‘belonging somewhere but then going out, belonging, going out. But my final destination, I’ll go back home’.

James feels that he is important to the university’s development, equating the presence of international students like himself with enhancing the university’s academic quality.

‘if you want to compete international-wise I think integrating, those different minds, inviting bright people here, you raise the university standard.’

To facilitate the fulfillment of this dream, for James what matters is the extent to which Port City University is integrated within the international world,

‘my supervisor had research grant from EU with other universities, Italy, German, Norway, so it was a collaborative research, that’s why I started my PhD’.

**Affect: bodily immersion, feeling academic**

James uses visceral, poetic language (blood, touch, feel) to describe how his academic experiences have affected him

‘I feel like even my blood now is into academia, my blood is into it, I can’t go anywhere. I can’t go to work in the industry’.

This extends to his sense of the buildings,
‘almost every building I’d say I have touched it … the newness, the appearance, the structure, the appearance of the environment, you feel it, oh I’m studying at university’.

Being a doctoral student is experienced as in his blood, a feeling that is essential, absorbing, life changing. It is bodily and emotional and his sense of the external campus is entwined with his ambition and drive. James’s sense of becoming academic seems beyond bodily boundaries, extending towards the buildings in which he is in an embodied relationship with.

**Intentionality: Towards developing African global expertise**

**Tina**

**Potency – becoming an agent of inter-cultural expansion into Port City**

For Tina, Port City felt like home even before she arrived. Her university courses in Sri Lanka were validated by Port City University and coming to Port City contains a sense of coming to the source of her academic foundations.

She mentions colonisation as a factor connecting Port City and Sri Lanka,

‘I feel like we’re a lot connected, I think also because of colonisation and everything’.

She sees herself as a link between Port City and Sri Lanka and wants to close the gap between them, believing that this will enrich both. Aware of the economic benefits that Sri Lankan students bring to Port City, she wants to grow the Sri Lankan student presence within Port City, for her country to occupy a stronger space within the university. She becomes a student ambassador as a means to inspire other international students to come to Port City and has a dream to inspire greater internationalisation beyond her time at Port City.
‘So if students know, especially students from Sri Lanka, that there are more Sri Lankans in the campus, they would be more willing to come because they would have like a community here. So it would be beneficial for the university because the international students pay like a lot of money as fees, ………. the profit generation would come from the international students because they would be paying like twice the amount as home students or an EU student would be paying’

Like James, she believes that international students like her are intrinsic to the success of a university,

‘the university is not the best university in UK, but it’s when we grow, the university also grows eventually, …… because someday it will become a bigger university and we were a part of that grow-up stage’.

Her educational dream contains agency, expansion and a sense of being part of something wider than herself and she sees her own success as intrinsically allied to the university’s ability to expand the numbers of Sri Lankan students.

**Affect: home, connection and safety**

Port City has a ‘homey’ feeling that is comfortable and supportive,

‘Port City has this effect of holding you in, it’s like you know that it’s far away from everything but you don’t want to move out of Port City because you like it so much’.

The campus and city feel safe and she experiences a freedom to move around with no concerns.
‘here I would just walk in the middle of the night, like if I’m in the library and if I feel like I want to come home at maybe like 2am or 3am or like 12am, I would just walk home and I don't feel very insecure at all’.

**Intentionality: towards growing Sri Lanka within Port City**

**Hannah**

**Potency: a proximal academic becoming, developing an independent stance towards learning – for children and self.**

Hannah enjoys learning the skills of independent study which feels different to the educational approach she was familiar with before coming to Port City,

‘the kind of skills I learn here, are like be independent in yourself and do it by yourself’.

Her academic experience is infused with anxiety about her English and about whether she will be able to get enough research participants. She contrasts her experience in Port City with Saudi Arabia and notes that students in Saudi Arabia are very study-focused and tend not to engage in extra-curricular activities. She sees the pedagogic approaches between the two countries as illustrated by her daughters’ education in Port City at a creative art school,

‘I see the difference here the school, like my daughters on the Art school is different so they focus on their work and projects, and doing art and all these things, and I found my daughter she’s very good at these things. Instead of just staying and hearing what the teacher says, they like to keep the students engaged and active to feel some responsibilities in what they do'.
She enjoys that her daughters are experiencing a more participative, engaged model of teaching and learning and feels that in Port City, her children are getting to exercise more intellectual and artistic freedom. She says that she will ensure that this continues when she returns to Saudi Arabia where she will send her daughters to a British school,

‘I will let them go to this school, so the way of teaching is like here, similar to here’.

Hannah’s educational dream is focused on her hopes for her children, hence it is a proximal dream, based on qualities she appreciates but due to her anxieties about her English and her research, she is not fully able to have for herself.

**Affect: educational aspiration for her children**

Hannah’s main affect appears in her aspiration for her children’s education path which is different to her own. She aspires for them rather than for herself.

She is pleased to hear others having fun as this distracts her from the pressure of her studies.

‘In the library some undergraduate student, they are from Egypt, and they make a lot of joke, and when I was writing I start to laughing about their jokes. So these kind of things, actions, it come to you and take you away from the real work so you have break and laugh’.

She enjoys seeing others (her children, other students) having freedom to engage in the educative space in ways that are counter-cultural for her and appreciates the western educative model of inquiry, questioning and independent thought.

**Intentionality: towards educational freedom for her children**
Phil

Potency: becoming an academic

Phil’s dream is to develop an academic identity, to learn from other academics. For him becoming an academic is a social practice, done not in isolation in a laboratory or library, but in connection with others. He is seeking a community of practice.

‘I feel like motivated to stay and work more if I see other people working, ............ I know it’s my work and I have to do it anyway but when I see other people working around me I’m feeling like I’m not the only one. I have to stay with other people, it’s like this is the life, it has to be like this’.

Seeing others work helps him to understand what life is like as a PhD student. He is working to cement his academic expertise and experience before he returns to Saudi Arabia and will be moving on to do a post doc in the UK.

‘So for me as an international student it’s the opportunity to for me to get experience before I go back home. ..... So my plan. I think can stay for four years in UK.’

Affect – yearning for academic community

Phil years for academic connectedness, is hungry to learn and acquire skills from established academics

‘I mean the staff. I mean if we met with them I’m sure we will learn all the skills, their interests, their motivation to do research, their projects, I mean a lot of stuff we can learn from them, we’re still students, we don’t have that experience as they have’.
He talks about his relationships with his supervisors. His primary supervisor left Port City and offered him the chance to transfer to her new university. He recalls,

‘I met with the second supervisor just outside her office and we talked about it and he convinced me to stay here. Like again he convinced me in the way we’re going to work together and then make a lot of publications, conferences.’

What motivated him to stay at Port City was the promise of academic collaboration and the development of a visible, outward, academic identity

**Intentionality: towards academic identity maturation**

**Sarah**

**Potency – freedom to become an academic, to develop a new cultural, academic identity**

Sarah’s prior academic background was one of struggle and difficulty where she felt herself to be out of step with prevailing academic discourses and ideologies.

‘Singapore’s education system is very different, so it’s very obsessed about the science and engineering, which is fair because of where we are positioned as country, but it also means if you like anything humanities, social sciences-wise, you would struggle a lot. So I struggled a lot in school only because what I liked wasn’t important, or wasn’t seen as useful’.

She relishes the academic freedom she experiences at Port City as it accords more with her ontology which is rooted within a qualitative, interpretist viewpoint. Being able to choose what she wants to study and how she studies it, has been liberating and powerful. In Port City she has found an intellectual space to affirm her values and skills and enable her to flourish academically,
‘for the first time in my life, I could just answer things without like law breaks, or checklists, it was just lovely and I loved it’.

In Singapore she felt out of step within the academic environment where as at Port City she enjoys what she perceives as the freedom to think differently, to think what she wants to think without a fear of failure or judgement,

‘a place where I could be myself without having to stress about life, whether I fit into the mould, whether I’m going to find a job’,

**Affect: Excitement, growth and validation**

Sarah is overjoyed and slightly disbelieving at the academic opportunities her studies have opened up for her,

‘sometimes I think it’s crazy, like am I actually doing a PhD, this is mental, cos I didn’t even think I was going to a university. …….. I never imagined myself to go to university’.

Her experience at Port City has changed her perception of herself as a scholar and enhanced her self-esteem, she is living beyond her earlier academic expectations for herself. This is exciting and also frightening. She expresses this symbolically when she talks about running down a steep hill in Port City,

‘just for the thrill of it, and then instantly regret because I’m actually really afraid of that feeling, so why I do it I don’t know.’

For Sarah personal growth is frightening but as in the hill example above, she keeps doing it because it is also ‘thrilling’. This example shows the anxiety and fear that accompanies new intellectual freedoms.
Intentionality: Towards a fulfilling academic identity

Linda

Potency: becoming inter-cultured

Linda has changed her academic discipline from digital sociology to an artistic digital-based practice PhD which has meant having to acquire more western historical and philosophical knowledge,

‘now I study for the art, so a little bit different, the method is different, so I need to know the history, and the art history, and the philosophy, but you know the philosophy is totally different from my country and the Western country, and some famous philosopher I don’t know them’

This puts her at a disadvantage when conversing with colleagues as she does not have the cultural knowledge base of western theory to fully participate. She works very hard to learn more sophisticated levels of academic English and is pleased to be enlarging her knowledge.

‘a lot of words that you read, and somehow a lot of words I can’t understand so I need to check, and I read very slow, but the result is very interesting, a know a lot of new things, new information, new knowledge that I hadn’t know before’.

Linda is excited by her expanding cultural knowledge but this is tinged with a sense of regret that she is unable, due to language, to share her Chinese cultural knowledge.

‘I think maybe if I can speak fluent English then I can introduce more from my culture background, the aesthetic culture, and the philosophy’.

Like Sarah, she is excited by the sense of academic freedom and for Linda this contains the possibility for inter-cultural knowledge-sharing.
Linda is impressed and pleased by the university’s efforts to support students’ learning by supplying PhD students with a range of IT equipment and by providing mental wellbeing sessions for doctoral students noting that in other educational contexts,

‘it seems our health we need to take care ourself, but here [in Port City] they think about that, it really make me feel warm’.

Like Steve and Hannah, Linda appreciates it when she perceives that the educational climate affords growth beyond study-related activities.

**Affect: curiosity and hunger for new learning**

Linda is driven to enlarge her knowledge in order to participate more fully in the conversations with other researchers in her department, she works hard at improving her language and knowledge. She is pleased at the opportunities to enlarge her knowledge and is touched and surprised by the steps the university takes to ensure her mental and physical health.

**Intentionality: towards intercultural academic knowledge and experience**

**Deborah – the absent educational dream**

**Impotency – sense of not being able to use her passion to create a satisfying life**

Deborah chose Port City because it offered her funding, she didn’t know about Port City before coming here and choose it on financial grounds.

‘I just applied to a bunch of different things and then got this one, they offered me funding, I took the first place that offered me funding’
She does not express enjoyment in her studies and is frank about her feelings,

‘I don’t particularly like being here in the uni’.

She gives little sense of a vision beyond her studies. She is orientated towards getting through the time

‘I mean it is what it is so I just kind of deal with it, I’m only here temporarily, like a couple of years, is kind of how I looked at it’.

She mentions that

‘In a past life I was almost a photographer. I turned down a lot of scholarships. ……I didn’t want to make it job, I didn’t want to like go into something to make me no money, no prospects and no future.’

This conveys a sense of seriously thinking about this career and of not having a belief that she could use her art to sustain herself. I interpreted this as a lost dream.

**Affect: feeling enclosed, trapped.**

Deborah describes being on the campus as,

‘being enclosed in concrete all day.’

She uses the word concrete to describe the campus nine times over two interviews and uses the word ‘trapped’ to describe her feelings.

Deborah’s testimony with its lack of talk about educative possibility is a stark contrast and reminder of the vivacity and affective potency that studying at Port City affords the other seven students.

**Intentionality: Towards finishing at Port City**

**Emplacement of the educational dream - the conceptual and the concrete.**
When place affords (Gibson, 1966) the educational dream, it surpasses the physicality of place but the physicality of place has a role in sustaining the dream – the dream needs to be emplaced within the physicality of campus. Place is seen through the lens of the educational dream and if place affords the dream, the dream is sustained. The educational dream presses against the material reality of campus and influences their experience. It influences their relationship with the place.

The inside-ness of the dream needs to be in relation to the outside-ness of campus, to occupy a space where the material meets the figurative, where the conceptual meets the concrete. The dream is an inside in the midst of an outside but this inside needs to go beyond the person into the place, in a form of exchange. The dream finds its nurture in aspects of the campus, in the materiality.

The spaces where the dream and place are exchanged intersect with their relationships of other places and spaces, most notably the academic spaces of their previous universities, this involves cultural contrasts.

In their making meaning of about the campus, international doctoral students, a minority group, are inevitably having to make personal sense of the campus that is used and constructed by the majority group. This impacts upon their experience directly through racism and social exclusion.

Finding conducive space to study and inhabit on the campus is an enduring theme.

**Steve – place as a site for self-becoming**

Steve uses the campus to support his dream, the buildings act upon him and, in the interrelationship or exchange, he senses the possibility of different freedoms. The
campus offers physical and emotional sustenance to support his maturation as a man.

The physical openness of the campus to the general public is different to his university in China and inspires him to think of the interplay between the city outside the university, and the university inside the city. He experiences the physical openness as a resource for the city which will enliven and enrich it.

As Steve and I walk around the campus, he reacts to the buildings and makes personal meanings in the different locations. The buildings and the walking interview inspire a process of reflective meaning making.

He notices that the J building is ‘very open’ and remembers the response he received from the International Office, inside J, following a racially-aggravated assault from a man in the city centre,

‘after this accident I just come here so asking for help so the people there are all very nice, they just gave me the law about the situation’

The building evokes the traumatic memory.

J is also a site of social engagement and inclusion with other international students, ‘And at the 5th floor because there is a ‘global friends’, so when I come here the first year I meet, I know many of the foreign, people from other countries, from Germany and from other countries, so we meet together and after the party, we may go to the pub and chat with each other. So it is very good, so I remember the 5th floor, we always have the meeting once a week, so there we can make friends.’
J has multiple meanings, of being looked after and included and of being attacked for being different but it is more than a repository of memories, whilst we walk, the building acts on him, triggering emotions in the present.

Steve shows me the building where he works five days a week. He is very located and engaged with the specifics, from the electronic doors,

‘It’s quite modern, you can see, when I come in, it’s automatic one, so in China we can’t find the door like this.’

To his desk, the kitchen, the toilets, his colleagues,

‘some are from European country, more from European country, and some China, some from India’.

He feels acknowledged by others inside this building and picks up differences between his office colleagues in China and in Port City,

‘They’re nice and when they pass by they’ll be, ‘hello’, or just ‘good morning’ and like that, but it is different with China, in China you have the colleague you don’t know, so they will all by themself, so they may not say hello to you, but here, in UK, I can feel their kindness.’

Whilst we are walking in the office, his supervisor approaches him and he introduces me. She is very warm to him and encouraging of my research, asking me if I need more students to participate.

He is very proud of his environment picking out features such as a large compass and the wave simulator. At one point he stops and shows me the view from a window
looking out on to the roundabout in the city. He tells me he often looks out of this window because,

‘the scenery is very good, especially when it begins darker and you can see the sunset, it’s really beautiful.’

Whilst we look out of the window, he talks about how the view makes him reflect upon the lack of physical barriers in the environment and reminds him again of the campus’s openness to the world,

‘because in China now there are a lot of high-rise building and you can’t even find the sky, do you know what I mean, so when I look up so all the high-rise building, like this one, so here you can see the clouds and the sky.’

He tells me that he finds the view relaxing and beautiful and I interpret his love of the sky as symbolising freedom and expansiveness given that he talks about it as a view with no barriers.

Steve’s interest in the campus is not merely functional, he is deeply connected with the specifics of the buildings, his colleagues and the work that is done and feels academically and personally nurtured in the buildings.

As we walk, the buildings trigger a process of meaning-making about the cultural differences, the facilities, other students and these meanings suggest that the campus partly functions for him as a site of a ‘self-becoming’ as exemplified in his educational dream.

James
James describes the campus as 'beautiful', 'clean' and 'fresh'. When asked to say more, he speaks in terms of the learning the campus affords him. Campus is beautiful because,

‘it’s exciting environment for learning, an environment I most like myself to use for learning, a lot of facilities, I can see my lab, I’m doing computer science engineering, which has a good computer lab. I was in S building before moving to D, we moved this year, around February, so before moving, our lab was still there, which is good facilities, computers, all facilities student needs to use. Yeah go to very, very nice university.’

For James the campus is relevant because enables his academic progress. He likes the library because he can book rooms for conference calls there with colleagues in other physical locations, describing this facility as,

‘very, very good, I never saw such kind of wonderful library’.

He talks about an academic paper he is writing in the library with colleagues from other institutions.

When we walk past the R building, he mentions that he studied for his academic teaching course there,

‘all our classes were in R building last year, so for two months there was, I was just doing my classes in R building’.

He relates to the campus in terms of how it supports and develops his teaching and learning. He represents his relationship with the campus through how it helps him to become an academic, unlike Steve for whom campus inspires sensory, personal meaning-making.
What matters to James is the extent to which the university is integrated into the world beyond its physical location. He is interested in how the campus enables meta-connection beyond its territory. For him a university’s engagement with the international world enhances its outputs and status and requires a mindset of looking outwards, of living beyond the local.

‘For your university to be recognised in the world, you should have a lot of international students. I think that was among the reason to categorise the best international students, of course one is research, but this other criteria is how internationally are you integrated? How do you integrate with the international world? How do you integrate with the other part of the world? So if the university has not a lot of students from other parts of the world, it’s lower down.’

He conceptualises himself as an international academic and this has a direct bearing on how he inhabits the campus. He is not looking to the campus for personal growth, he is looking for campus to practically facilitate his academic growth both in and beyond Port City. His sense of campus therefore is simultaneously entwined with his sense of ‘beyond campus’ and campus is important because it will permit him to go beyond it.

‘you think three years I’ll be doing my PhD so what after three years, where will I go, what next, yeah those kind of feelings, those feelings come sometimes yeah and you say oh maybe something is I’ll do this, I’ll do this, I’ll do this, I’ll do this, I’ll do this, so kind of going and coming, yes coming, going, it’s coming, going’.

This ‘going and coming, coming, going’ reflects a restlessness, a sense of constant movement, of passing through and beyond. James is a man in a constant state of
academic becoming, engaged in a busy relationship with place but mainly with his future. The campus is a site of academic endeavour, it is a transitional place.

**Tina**

For Tina the campus is refracted through the social relationships she makes there. When asked directly about how she experiences the physicality of campus she replies,

‘Because I am also a student ambassador in the university, so I do campus tours so I know all the buildings.’

It is not the showing of the buildings that is important to Tina, it is the showing them to other people that matters, the actual buildings are not figural for her, what she is navigating isn’t just the physical space but is primarily the social space, the relationship between her and others,

‘I really like that role because it’s like you’re representing the university, and maybe it’s a potential student or maybe for a student who’s already registered. It’s like you find it proud to be a part of this institution, and then you’re given this opportunity to present it to another person who’s coming on board with that.’

She enjoys being part of something that she can use to engage with others. Tina identifies a specific relationship with the library,

‘sometimes when I have something like a deadline or a meeting coming up and I have to really organise my work, I would just pack whatever food and I would just come to the library and like just stay.’
The accessibility of the library means that she is able to place herself, away from the seduction of social opportunities and focus on her work,

‘So at night I think because everyone’s asleep you don’t really have anyone to talk to at that moment so you can do work, so I think that’s why it works for me.’

She feels safe navigating the campus and walking home even in the early hours of the morning.

When mentioning difficulties such as the fact that everything seems to close on campus at 5pm, the distance of her office from the central campus and delays in getting her visa sorted, she is quick to find positives such as, the ability to get snacks 24/7 from machines in the library, the facility to find places to study outside of her office and in terms of the visa she suggests that,

‘it’s getting better now, but because in the beginning we didn’t have that thing, it was a new thing that was introduced, so I think UK is becoming more favourable towards Sri Lanka.’

Like Steve, the buildings have an emotional charge and meaning which she identifies on the walk. When buildings close early, the campus is more ‘peaceful’ for study, it feels ‘safe’ at all hours and despite problems in getting a visa, the International Office are ‘helpful’ and ‘supportive’.

She mentions that she is participating in the research to help the university to become more attractive to international students, particularly the Sri Lankan market. It is possible that this shapes her responses to me.
Throughout when asked about the campus, she talks in terms of using the space with other people and about their activities. In the course of those activities with others, the campus becomes a good place. She is clear about her reasons for coming to Port City,

‘the reason coming to this country, and coming to Port City specifically, because it’s far away and all, is to get the maximum out of it, meet more people, make friends.’

Tina’s meaning making of her experience of campus involves an element of choice. She perceives something happening and chooses to frame it positively. When she talks about one of the buildings she notes,

‘it’s an old building it has that very gloomy effect sometimes, so the lecture halls and corridors they cast that gloominess. But here it’s quite nice but I think they’re doing a lot of renovation so hopefully it’ll be fine. I think when you enter from the cafeteria there’s another space where they have like a couch, so that area is also quite sunny as well, I tend to go there as well, that’s like if I have like any work to work on my laptop I would go there.’

This paragraph encapsulates how she frames her experience of place, she acknowledges a negative (gloom), identifies a solution (ongoing renovation) and finds a sunny place to occupy within it.

**Hannah**

Hannah’s office is empty when we visit and she mentions that she prefers it when it is empty and quiet. She worries about other people touching her equipment and has a sign on her desk saying, ‘Don’t touch anything on this desk.’ She explains,
‘sometimes I came and I found I couldn’t find my chair, it had been replaced with another one, and sometimes I couldn’t find my mouse, or they use my computer and they have to do some work there, so I really put this sign so they know’

She prefers an empty space and mentions how the presence of other students last year made working difficult. When she mentions the library, it is in terms of the facility to book private study rooms. She mentions that her office where she spends six hours a day lacks ventilation and how she tried to change location but was not able to.

Hannah’s experience of the campus is one of physical and emotional isolation and discomfort, this comes through in her experience of doing the doctorate,

‘when I come here I learn new things of doing the research, of how to do it, how to make the literature review and these things, and to how to solve problem, and how to face the challenge and try to work hard. So these are the kind of skills I learn here, and like be independent in yourself and do it by yourself.’

Whilst liking to work alone, she does not want to feel socially isolated but experiences a lack of agency to impact upon this. Below she describes trying to join a group for cybersecurity students,

‘And the other thing I don’t like about the PhD, there is no communication with others on social in the university…… I joined these people, they are undergraduate. But I can’t keep with them with going to all the meetings, and learn new things, cos I am trying to make new friends and be sociable, but because of the time I couldn’t.’

Later when talking about other students she remarks,
'you want to become friends with them and work with them, I couldn’t find any...’

There is a sense of powerlessness to influence her material and social environment. When talking about attending fitness classes on campus, she reflects that,

‘the facilities here they have all the facilities, and here they have a lot of activity, they do it for student, which is a good thing. So we lack of these things, we don’t have these activities in my university.’

She uses the word ‘we’ and ‘my’ to refer to her university in Saudi Arabia several times and does not use these terms of belonging in relation to Port City at any point.

In terms of emplacement, she is unable ‘emplace’ herself on the campus in a satisfactory way.

Her office is too warm and too noisy and she lacks time to find friends. When there are other people in her office they,

‘just come and do their work, they don’t have the time, their time is very specific for them so they just want to go to work and finish their work, because the PhD it never stops.’

Her educational dream is not emplaced within campus and seems transposed upon her ambitions for her children. Her experience of campus does not feel satisfactory to her and does not seem to offer her either academic or social inspiration. Her academic experience seems characterised by a sense of having to be independent and unsupported and she is socially isolated and feels unable to influence either state.
In contrast she talks about making friends with other parents at her daughter’s school, whilst waiting at the school gates, and of enjoying the influence of the school’s pedagogic approach of inquiry and questioning upon her children’s academic identity. This seems to have more of an emotional charge and meaning for her than her own PhD which feels relentless, ‘it never stops’, and anxiety provoking.

Phil (movement, disruption, powerlessness)
Phil’s first office was in XH, outside of his faculty but as he was living in Cardiff where his wife studied, he did not use the office much. Following a move to Port City, he was given office space in AX which was a hugely beneficial experience,

‘Being here with my supervisors, and also meeting with other students, talking with them about their experience, sometimes taking their advice, also meeting with the other staff, especially when I moved here to AX I was surrounded by other staff from the same school and education. So it was like when I had any difficulty in some like analysing data for example, or if I had difficulty in, like because I’m international student sometimes finding the ideal word to explain a situation is difficult, so it’s easy just like to ask anyone around me. So it was helpful when I moved here and made a big difference in this matter’.

This quote above encapsulates how Phil’s conceptualisation of learning as a social and community activity, enacted in a social context. This was the happiest time for him during his studies and he describes how being alongside others in AX Building motivated him.

Later he mentions feeling isolated in AX building noticing that staff there did not seem willing to engage socially with him,
‘In other cultures it seems quite weird if you see someone every day, you work in the same area, you don’t say hi or hello it’s quite strange. This is just about saying hi and hello, things simple like this. Sometimes I don’t even know how they’re doing, or what are they teaching, nothing at all because I don’t see any kind of communication with them’.

When asked to reflect upon this, he feels that, ‘maybe they aren’t curious’ and goes on to describe having more satisfying social and intellectual contact with other international students.

His department was moved into the R building, which he described as ‘a disaster’ because the physical set up was a large open-plan area which was noisy and distracting,

‘it’s open area, and everyone walk around you, talk, and not only the staff or student, some visitors they come. So it’s difficult to concentrate or do anything in there’.

In response, staff and students increasingly began to work from home, coming in just for meetings, depriving him of the academic community he valued.

Additionally he was not allocated his own workspace.

‘And when they moved to R building I don’t have my own space. They moved like six months ago, there is a hot desk I can use but I don’t have my own space in there …… you could come any day, find someone using that desk.’

In response he asked the faculty office for a dedicated work space and this was not given, so he trawled the campus searching for a conducive work space.
'So they didn't offer me, I tried to go and find space myself, and I found a space. They didn't even reply to my, I mean they didn't even contact me or tell me about a space. I kept going every week or two weeks there. I found my own space. They didn't know I was there at all.'

After four months of looking, he found an empty, open-access room in another university building off the main campus, where he completed his writing up.

The impact of the move and of him finding his own space to study has taken him out of contact with other staff and he also feels that there was insufficient opportunity to learn about academic life from practising academics,

‘I came here to Port City University, I came here to meet other staff, other professionals, to learn from them,'

The campus has not afforded him these opportunities and he had to work hard over time to find a suitable space to work.

Sarah – uses green spaces to sustain herself - emplacement

Sarah’s educational dream is about academic and therefore existential self-development. The academic opportunities presented to her are frightening as well as exciting and thrilling and she uses campus as means to comfort and support herself through this, particularly evident in her efforts to find areas of beauty to sustain herself.

Sarah is highly reflective about her experience of campus making choices about where she places herself and meaning about how she occupies it.
She uses intentionality and agency in searching out natural spaces which she uses for emotional support.

She walks daily through the reservoir area because it is ‘the greenest part of campus’, liking that you can be in the park yet close enough to the city to hear the sounds of traffic,

‘you hear the cars but you’re not part of the traffic but you are with it, if that makes sense. It’s like being part of the environment without having to participate in it ........ you have the greenery which is very calming for me, so it feels like I’m always separate from all my stress’

She uses the park as a place to be still and the greenery to ‘separate’ her from her stress. I think that in the extract above, metaphorically she is telling me that she uses the park to let go of the stressful effort of troubling aspects of selfhood that are, nevertheless and always, present, albeit at a distance.

The value of the green space is intensified by the presence of the traffic,

‘I used to think silence is the way to go, but sometimes when your head is so noisy, some other noise is better. You wouldn’t associate traffic with non-stress situations, but actually it’s quite helpful.’

She loves a small green area for the 'greens'; ‘the flowers’ especially, the, ‘magnolias, they are the first flowers to bloom in spring’. Magnolias are important to her because they have meaning in Asian culture, they symbolise purity and sacrifice. The magnolias in Port City are a link to her culture and offer a sense of continuity between Singapore and Port City.
She seeks out green spaces amidst the noise of campus, ‘to get in touch with myself’. Nature anchors her and she notices it, even in small spaces such as the planters, and in winter she waits for the flowers to bloom again,

‘it’s really hard to live in Winter, I really struggle with like no leaves on plants………

Winter on the campus I try and avoid because it's really sad and grey, when the plants are blooming it’s fine but when everything is just bare and empty and it’s cold and it’s raining, it’s very difficult to feel comfortable here.’

I interpret this conversation as being as much about the difficulties of finding a place for Sarah to ‘feel herself’ in Port City (as symbolised by Winter) as it is about her love of nature. The language she uses express something about how much effort it takes to find a place in Port City where she can ‘be herself’ and also about how difficult it is at times to bloom.

She describes her office as a site of discomfort where it is, ‘hard to breathe’, telling me that she is the only person in her office who is at the same stage as her and that everyone else seems to know what they are doing in a way that she doesn’t.

She finds her office lonely, stating that her geographer colleagues are, ‘always somewhere else, so there’s always people on fieldwork, it's really hard to build long relationships if you only see one another like once a month’.

This lack of community is also echoed in Hannah and Phil’s narratives.

In addition to feeling isolated, being in her office arouses anxiety as the glass walls makes her feel exposed. Being proximal to staff who were formally her lecturers when she was an undergraduate makes her feel self-conscious,
‘you come to postgrad and you’re like on the other side. It’s really bizarre, I never know what to do with myself, when we sit all together, I’m just wondering, what shall I say?’

When we walk past a former church-turned-teaching and conference space, she states that she feels that the building represents a situation where worship and teaching activities can coexist together,

‘having it here is visually liberating in a weird way, so recognising a building has a multiuse is possible, that they can all coexist even though there’s different philosophies. I love it, I think it is great.’

The idea of Port City as a place of intellectual freedom and possibility recurs during the walk,

‘I think that’s what I like about Port City … because my lecturers they’re really open to new ideas and stuff, I’ve never mentioned an idea and they say no this is shit,’

Sarah relates an anecdote about a Port City resident accusing her of ‘stealing’ UK jobs. She tells me that she works as a cleaner in the student union and that,

‘no-one wants to apply for the job, we have a huge problem staffing-wise’. I am not sure if she wishing to assure me, a white, British researcher, that she is not taking a high-status job from British people or whether she is, rhetorically, justifying having her job to the Port City people who accuse her of this.

Her job role affects how she relates to the Student Union premises, the fact that it is a place of work means, ‘it becomes stressful because it’s where my job is’.

As a toilet cleaner she has a close relationship with intimate dirt observing,
'you see a pattern of like where the finances are with the student body, especially when the students have got their funding, or the study loan thing that they get. So when that comes in you can tell because it's always dirty that week.'

Later she talks about how her role impacts upon her social relations within the space of the Student Union, informing me that although they are ‘disgusting’, she ‘loves working on toilets because, with toilets, you don’t speak to anyone else’. She then recounts instances where students walk over a newly mopped floor, treat her as if she is invisible and ask her if she can speak English (even though all SU employees are university students).

‘you also get people who are really rude and think you’re a cleaner and therefore, you don’t understand English, or there’s different layers of weirdness, I’m a student as well, we’re all students, it's bizarre though......... I know I’m a cleaner who’s Asian but it's doesn’t mean I can’t speak English, .... But when you’re a student in a student environment, you don’t expect that kind of assumption … and it can be a bit troubling to think that most of the students still hold those assumptions'

Her experiences of racism from students within the Student Union,

‘makes me feel if I’m not welcome here, do I really want to spend do much money because it’s a lot of school fees to be here.’

She contrasts this with the ‘warm’, ‘inclusive’ ‘bubble’ of her office which, whilst it contains social stressors, is not perceived as a site of racism.

We walk past the M and she associates being on this side of campus with going to the train station and to the shops noticing that,
'its quite a nice place for me in terms of, it helps me see how different I’ve changed. I’ve been here four years now and I’ve grown as a person .... So sometimes when I walk this path, it helps me remember what it was like to be an undergrad, and what it is like to be a postgrad now.’

Later she comments,

‘walking in certain places helps you remember what it is like to be in a different space’

Places on campus evoke mental ‘spaces’ and help her to remember life transitions and personal changes.

**Linda –**

Linda is struck by the newness of the buildings on campus, noticing how small it is compared to Chinese universities and how close the buildings are to each other. Her daily practice is to work at home in the morning, learning and practising English vocabulary, and going to her office in the afternoon. In addition to a geographical adjustment, Linda has found that she does not have the vocabulary and knowledge to speak using western cultural academic references. This influences how she engages with other students,

‘so I like to write more, and my drawings are communication and others talking.’

The campus does not enable her speech and she tends to use her time at home to learn and practice language and learn about culture.

Nowhere does she state or allude to interest in her culture from other staff and students.
She talks about loneliness and the shock of finding herself the only non-European student in her office, in her house and in the café. When talking about feeling alone she describes how in China her university,

‘will control us, will protect us. We can’t be away [from university accommodation] after eleven o’clock at night. We need to be back to campus before that time. But it seems in Britain it’s quite a freedom, they have a lot of freedom.’

It is unclear as to whether Linda prefers the protection and companionship afforded by her Chinese university but the juxtaposition of talking about feeling lonely may suggest some level of cultural dislocation and possible feelings of vulnerability.

She loves her office because the large windows face the city centre shopping centre which pleases her and although there generally only tends to be her and her colleague in the office, being there makes her feel part of a team.

She enjoys the fact that her office contains a cuddly toy of a pink panther. The toy is the size of a toddler and she says that when

‘we are quite tired, we can play with him.’

She notices that from the label, that the toy is made in China and that its colours, pink and yellow, make her feel ‘happy and excited’.

When Linda talks about the pink panther, I think of Winnicott’s transitional object, which helps people survive and navigate significant life transitions and wonder if this toy provides similar comfort. It is a soft (cuddly) object made in China, her home country and its placement in her office seems to offer comfort amidst change and loneliness.
What has given Linda most joy has been the cultural opportunities on offer at the university in campus venues such as the onsite cinema and theatre. She has attended art activities, musical performances and films on campus, particularly appreciating the exposure to western classical instruments and music styles. She describes how art and culture can unite disparate people,

‘I’m quite surprised that even sometimes we have different perception, different background, the art, what we express, is the same …….. it seems we have the very similar understanding……. We have the same understanding of what is good, what is mortal, what is a bad thing, maybe we just express it different’

She seems to be suggesting that for her art expresses something universal about the human condition, something that helps her to feel connected across cultures.

In our face-to-face interview Linda talks about some postgraduate wellbeing sessions that she has attended. These sessions highlighted the stressful nature of doctoral study and she realised that what she had been conceptualising as her problem was in fact,

‘a common thing, everyone have stress’.

Talking about the sessions prompted reflections upon how in her culture it is not usual to talk about feeling stressed and because of this, it is difficult to know if the stressful feelings she has are ‘normal’ or require professional help. She mentions how if someone experiences undue stress for a long time, it could lead to suicide and that she is grateful for the information from the wellbeing sessions. It is only after the interview that I wonder if she is telling me that she has felt suicidal and I also wonder how I as a counsellor failed to probe or question her on this.
Finally Linda notices how clean the campus is and talks about a patch of daffodils near her office which smell ‘really nice’ and notes that ‘they tell me it’s spring.’

**Deborah – ‘a very concrete campus’**

Deborah expresses disappointment with the campus calling it ‘tiny’, ‘a Soviet bloc because of the concrete’; ‘very 1970s’; ‘non-attractive’. She uses the adjective concrete most frequently to describe the campus, likening being on campus to ‘being enclosed in concrete all day’.

This contrasts sharply with James’ association of campus with beauty and transnational learning. Concrete lacks fluidity and the image of being ‘enclosed’ in concrete conveys a sense of being trapped on all sides. Concrete can inhibit growth and I think of how hard and time consuming it would be to break through concrete.

Deborah seems to occupy a limited geographical daily scope which is planned and directed,

‘I pretty much navigate between two rooms and a coffee shop’.

She seems to lack connection with other aspects of campus, apart from her laboratory, her office and the vegetarian café. When we visit her laboratory we have this exchange,

‘DEBORAH: So this is where I spend a lot of my time.

ME: So what percentage of your time up here?

DEBORAH: Nine till five.

ME: In this room?’
DEBORAH: Yeah, well I tend to go off for an hour and do other things to give my eyes a rest, try not to strain them too much’

She seems to spend a lot of time in one place and I think back to the world ‘enclosed’ as the lab feels enclosed, removed and secluded. When we walk there, we are the only 2 people in the space and the silence and emptiness of the clinical atmosphere makes me feel lonely and disengaged.

Outside of her office and the laboratory, Deborah tells me that sometimes she sits on the stairwell where she ‘can see the weather coming in’.

Later she describes a memory of sitting in the stairwell, watching the snow pile up. The built environment of campus is experienced as hard, concrete and uncomfortable. Her laboratory is ‘either really hot … or really cold and you can’t open the windows’. Throughout the walk I notice that she seems to be situated outside of aspects of the world that contain human relating, describing herself as liking to spend from 9am to 5pm in her pollen laboratory, on her own with her microscope, chopping up pollen samples.

When talking about a snapchat photo of the pollen lab at night, Deborah likens it to a ‘mental institution’ an image which evokes enforced exclusion and distress

Later we walk to her desk space in an open plan office. There is no-one in the vast office which she prefers because ‘whenever there’s movement around me and people talking, I can’t focus’ but generally describes doing non-lab work from home because, ‘I don’t want to sit there’ and ‘I feel like I’m falling asleep up there because I can’t breathe’.
The campus as a space feels enclosing and trapping and disconnected from the natural world. She alludes to working outside in the summer but this is experienced as unsatisfactory,

‘Well you go outside with all the, well put it this way, especially up here, you can see all the old buildings, very plain cement structures, yeah it just kind of blocks the sky and you don’t see anything green, it’s just paved over everywhere here on campus, there’s not really any green on campus, like except for that little garden but it’s not much at all.

ME: You mean the park?

Yeah, and it’s completely put out of the way and no-one really sees it, you have to go that other way to go to it. They keep on installing more concrete’

When she alludes to greenery on campus she notices that, ‘They keep putting like planters around, the plants they have a really sad and they like die and they leave them there, it’s just like come on guys.’

Deborah experiences the campus as blocking. It does not seem to inspire the kind of creative associations as it does for Steve and James for whom campus inspires thoughts of going beyond themselves in some way. It is tempting to think of Deborah as having an existential emotional reaction to the campus but this implies a dichotomy between outside and inside. Rather it seems to me that it is not just that her body is responding to the parts of the campus she chooses to show me but that some sort of exchange is happening that is less differentiated, involving externalisation of interior experience and internalising of her exterior experience.
### Appendix 11 - EXTRACTS of Significant Statements for Steve and Sarah

**Steve (extract)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant statements about campus</th>
<th>Meaning formulation</th>
<th>Tentative Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strangers may come in.</td>
<td>Freedom for all to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People can walk through.</td>
<td>enter/porosity</td>
<td>Cultural/ideological aspects of campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyone can just feel the</td>
<td>Feeling an</td>
<td>Sensual response to being-in-campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atmosphere about university,</td>
<td>atmosphere/feeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can feel that everyone does</td>
<td>You can feel things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their thing.</td>
<td>about campus/feeling</td>
<td>Cultural/ideological aspects of campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>campus/freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In China they should get a</td>
<td>campus evokes past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>license.</td>
<td>campuses – cultural</td>
<td>Cultural comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in China the students may be</td>
<td>Comparison with past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more stressed than here I think.</td>
<td>campus – less stressed</td>
<td>Embodiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyone may do what they’re</td>
<td>Campus is for more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested in apart from the work,</td>
<td>than study</td>
<td>Cultural/ideological aspects of campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside things,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah, because in China now</td>
<td>Economic progress</td>
<td>Cultural/ideological aspects of campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there are a lot of high-rise</td>
<td>happens at the expense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building and you can’t even</td>
<td>of access to nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find the sky, do you know what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mean, so when I look up so all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the high-rise building, like this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one, so here you can see the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clouds and the sky.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this place is for art so all the</td>
<td>Buildings have feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people in the building, they work</td>
<td>associated with who</td>
<td>Sensual response to being-in-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with passion. They’re very</td>
<td>uses them</td>
<td>campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passionate about their clothes and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their hair, very passionate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents say that I grew up.</td>
<td>Became a man/place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can think more, and I really</td>
<td>and growth</td>
<td>Campus as part of identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think I’m a man. .... I</td>
<td></td>
<td>formation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
think it’s a very good experience here …. In China, as a student, the parents will give you all the things so it will not help you to just deal with the problems ..... but if you study here, you will be, how to say, you can be a man I think.

**EXTRACT of Significant Statements**

**Sarah (Extract)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant statements about campus</th>
<th>Meaning formulation</th>
<th>Tentative Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So it’s second nature, I don’t really think about it, it’s not something I do on purpose, I just do it anyway, so even in Singapore when I’m working I gravitate to green spaces, so it’s like a habit, but it’s also an emotional reliance kind of thing.</td>
<td>Transposing of past bodily and emotional habits, Gravitate to green for support</td>
<td>Campus as restorative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because green spaces .................. you know to expect, what to do, what’s expected of you.</td>
<td>Safety of green spaces</td>
<td>Intelligible places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the fact that a church can be a place where you have classes,</td>
<td>Co-location of academic and spiritual uses</td>
<td>Cultural/ideological aspects of campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having it here is visually liberating.</td>
<td>visually liberating</td>
<td>Sensual response to being-in-campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognising a building has a multiuse is possible, that they can all coexist even though there’s different philosophies.</td>
<td>Coexisting philosophies in one building</td>
<td>Cultural/ideological aspects of campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my lecturers they’re really open to new ideas and stuff, I’ve never mentioned an idea and they say no this is shit.</td>
<td>academically permissive culture</td>
<td>Cultural/ideological aspects of campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore’s education system is very different, so it’s very obsessed about science and engineering, if you like anything humanities, social sciences-wise, you would struggle a lot. So I struggled a lot in school</td>
<td>Prior academic experience -struggle against</td>
<td>Cultural comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only because what I liked wasn’t important, or wasn’t seen as useful.</td>
<td>Past and present – difficult past</td>
<td>Cultural comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a social sharing inspirational kind of space. When I’m really excited about an idea and I need to hear someone’s opinion, the office is amazing.</td>
<td>Office as site of academic inspiration</td>
<td>Office as a site of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘a nice and warm bubble where everyone’s so inclusive’</td>
<td>Office as site of welcome</td>
<td>Office as a site of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The office is an open space and I sit right by the aisle, so people are always walking past. It’s quite challenging for me because I never know whether I should speak to them, or how much conversation is too much. So, I smile every time they walk past.</td>
<td>Unknown social norms and rules of office</td>
<td>Office as a site of discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So sometimes I avoid the office when I’m not ready to face all these questions on my own. When I have a deadline coming up for example, I will lock myself in my own room and not come out the house basically so that I have the space to actually be with my head instead of having to stress about all of these other social bits of the office.</td>
<td>Office stress – embodied response Office – distraction from intellect</td>
<td>Embodied response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 12 - Code Book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Code name</th>
<th>Explanation of code</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Overarching Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sensual response to being-in-campus</td>
<td>Eliciting pleasure: beautiful, wonderful, passionate, splendid, feeling of campus (James, Steve, Deborah, Tina, Linda, Phil, Sarah)</td>
<td>Conceptual thinking (the sensual response inspires conceptual thinking)</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Embodied response</td>
<td>Bodily impress of campus-stress, warm feeling, alone, unable to breathe, bodily attachment to place (Steve, Linda, Deborah, Sarah, Phil, James)</td>
<td>Conceptual thinking (students use their embodied response to think conceptually)</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cultural comparison</td>
<td>Comparison between Port city/Port City Campus and their home country (all participants)</td>
<td>Conceptual thinking</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>Campus inspires imagination: arts building=passion=colourful bodies; blood metaphor, bloom metaphor (Steve, Hannah, James, Deborah, Sarah)</td>
<td>Bodily imagination (about own and others’ bodies)</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cultural/ideological aspects of campus</td>
<td>Campus expresses and offers: freedom of movement; freedom of choice, freedom of thought, academic freedom, individualism (all participants)</td>
<td>Embedded cultural values</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spatial isolation</td>
<td>Surrounded by others but feeling alone, no camaraderie (Deborah, Phil, Linda, Sarah, Hannah)</td>
<td>Not Body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>Lack of language proficiency impacts ability to participate with home students (Steve and Linda)</td>
<td>Not body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Familiar places</td>
<td>Places where overseas home and Port City connect, places of familiarity e.g. concert halls, green spaces, student union, library (all participants)</td>
<td>Campus as consolation</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Office as a site of discomfort</td>
<td>Dimensions of code = environmental discomfort, too cold, too stuffy; lack of cultural understanding of office expectations on bodies; lack of appropriate space for bodies (Deborah, Phil, Hannah, Linda, Sarah)</td>
<td>Not body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Office as a site of community</td>
<td>Collegiality and friendship, intellectual community (Steve, James, Sarah)</td>
<td>Some body</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Campus as part of identity formation</td>
<td>Campus activity and culture supports identity development, e.g. becoming a man, becoming academic, becoming multi-cultural (all participants except Deborah and Hannah)</td>
<td>Conceptual thinking (about self)</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Campus as restorative</td>
<td>Students seek out parts of campus that offer them consolation or support during difficult times e.g., park, seeking out green spaces, library, a window view, concerts on campus (Phil, Sarah, Steve, Hannah, Linda)</td>
<td>Campus as consolation</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>With other international students and not home students (Steve, James, Phil, Tina, Hannah, Linda)</td>
<td>Some Body</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Embodied familiarity with</td>
<td>Seeking out familiar others e.g., Steve-Korean supervisor, fellow Chinese</td>
<td>Some Body</td>
<td>Extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international students</td>
<td>students, Global Friends group; Linda - Asian friends, Greek friends; Phil – Muslim community and Saudi Students; Hannah – Arabic speaking students; Tina -Indian students and other international students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Any Body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Institutional indifference</td>
<td>Students approach university staff with problems but these are not acknowledged or understood (Steve given incomprehensible advice; Phil not understood; Hannah ignored)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Helplessness</td>
<td>In the face of racism, of institutional indifference, towards those in power (Steve, Hannah, Sarah)</td>
<td>Any Body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Invisible bodies</td>
<td>In the office (Phil); unseen by home students (Phil and Steve); unseen in office (Linda and Hannah)</td>
<td>Not Body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Standing out</td>
<td>Places where they perceive themselves as a minority – city, university department, office (Steve, Sarah, Linda, James)</td>
<td>Contested body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>British Bodies</td>
<td>British bodies are societally privileged above international bodies (Steve and Sarah)</td>
<td>No body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Racial attacks</td>
<td>Instances of attacks – Steve physically and verbally assaulted x 2; Sarah 3 instances of racism (verbal)</td>
<td>Contested Body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>White fragility</td>
<td>Sarah’s friends are unable to hear her account of racism and perceive it as an attack on them</td>
<td>No Body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Perceived value of self to the university</td>
<td>International bodies are valuable as sources of income and enhance reputation (university not perceived as valuing their</td>
<td>No body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Contested bodies</td>
<td>Their bodies occupation of place is questioned or disputed e.g. Sarah’s ability to speak English questioned; seen as an ‘import bride’; a thief of jobs. Steve – shouted at by teenager; attacked by British man on the street; abused in a burger bar</td>
<td>Contested Body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lingering of distressing experiences in the body</td>
<td>Sarah – cannot use university spaces without discomfort, embodied response. Steve’s body will remember his experiences even after he has forgotten what happened.</td>
<td>Contested Body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ability to identify with others using own experience</td>
<td>Sarah understands the responses of white friends to her accounts of racism; Phil attributes the non-response of home students and staff as a consequence of business; Steve tries to understand his attacker’s circumstances and also why home students don’t make friends with international students</td>
<td>Contested Body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Double consciousness</td>
<td>Consciousness of self and of how self is perceived by others – Steve and Sarah</td>
<td>Contested Body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Intelligible places</td>
<td>Students seek out places where they understand what is expected from them and use these as a means to support themselves during cultural/social difficulty e.g sports clubs, green spaces, library, research groups (Steve, Sarah, Hannah, Linda, James)</td>
<td>Campus as Consolation’</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Excluded from social participation</td>
<td>Sarah does not drink and feels excluded from pub-based social life, Hannah’s childcare means</td>
<td>Not Body</td>
<td>Interrupt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
she cannot attend evening socials
Appendix 13 - Summary of Tracy’s eight big-tent criteria for excellent qualitative research.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for quality (end goal)</th>
<th>Various means, practices and methods through which to achieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthy topic</td>
<td>The topic of the research is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Timely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich rigour</td>
<td>The study uses a sufficient, abundant, appropriate, and complex:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Set of theoretical constructs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data and time in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sample(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Context(s)

• Data collection and analysis processes

Sincerity
The study is characterized by:

• Self-reflexivity about subjective values, biases, and inclinations of the researcher(s)

• Transparency about the methods and challenges

Credibility
The research is marked by:

• Thick description, concrete detail, explication of tacit (non-textual) knowledge and showing rather than telling

• Triangulation or crystallization

• Multivocality

• Member reflections

Resonance
The research influences, impacts, or moves particular readers or a variety of audiences through:

• Aesthetic, evocative representation

• Naturalistic generalizations

• Transferable findings

Significant contribution
The research provides a significant contribution:

• Conceptually/theoretically
• Practically

• Morally

• Methodologically

• Heuristically

Ethics

The research considers:

• Procedural ethics (such as human subjects)

• Situational and culturally specific ethics

• Relational ethics

• Exiting ethics (leaving the scene and sharing the research)

Meaningful coherence

The study:

• Achieves what it purports to be about

• Uses methods and procedures that fit its stated goals.

• Meaningfully interconnects literature, research questions/foci, findings, and interpretations with each other