

From complexity to compassion: reimagining higher education through academic hospitality, integrity and systems thinking

Ella Ruth Anaya, Sergio Cepero Espinosa and Gang Li
*Master of Arts of Leadership, Trinity Western University,
Langley, Canada*

Abstract

Purpose – In an era characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA), higher education institutions must evolve beyond technical solutions and adopt holistic, equity-driven frameworks that foster human flourishing. This article explores how VUCA Prime principles – vision, understanding, clarity and agility – combined with systems thinking, academic hospitality and a commitment to social goodness, can offer a renewed model for international student engagement and institutional resilience.

Design/methodology/approach – A mixed method research design guided two distinct studies. The first focused on academic hospitality and the second on academic integrity. The hospitality study surveyed 524 international graduate students, followed by six focus group interviews. Pre- and post-surveys and interviews of four focus groups were conducted to examine academic integrity awareness and practices of a sample of 153 participants.

Findings – Key tensions and transformative practices were identified across three domains: (1) culturally responsive pedagogical hospitality, (2) integrity in global academic contexts and (3) leadership strategies for inclusion and ethical formation. The findings highlight how institutional leadership can navigate systemic complexity by centering student voices, fostering trust, and co-creating academic cultures rooted in belonging, accountability, and ethical agency.

Research limitations/implications – While this research offers substantial contextual analysis, the bounded design may limit the transferability of the findings. Both studies were conducted within a graduate program using convenience sampling, limiting generalizability despite the sample's diversity across more than 35 countries, particularly from the Global South. Study 1 relied on descriptive analyses, not causal testing. Study 2 captured short-term shifts in confidence and ethical reasoning through self-reported data, examining immediate educational impacts rather than long-term behavioral change. Additionally, the rapid evolution of generative AI technologies and institutional policies means that the findings reflect a context requiring further longitudinal and cross-cultural research.

Practical implications – For senior leaders, practical implications include adopting a systems-thinking approach to international student support and aligning academic policies, curriculum and services to enhance trust and fairness. Strategic planning should reflect VUCA Prime by clarifying vision, deepening understanding of student contexts, and ensuring coherence across integrity, AI and assessment policies. Academic hospitality must be institutionalized through sustained support structures that address cultural transition and well-being. Finally, institutions should develop clear, coordinated AI and integrity governance, integrating consistent guidelines across programs and adapting them in response to technological change.

Originality/value – The results contribute to the global redefinition of higher education by advancing actionable insights for policy, pedagogy, and leadership, grounded in a large, globally diverse sample drawn from more than 35 countries, with strong representation from the Global South. This breadth strengthens the study's contribution to understanding the ethical, intercultural, and pedagogical demands of the 21st-century.

Keywords Academic hospitality, Academic integrity, Canadian higher education, International students, VUCA Prime, Systems thinking, AI literacy

Paper type Research article



Introduction

Higher education operates within a period of sustained disruption often described as volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA). Universities function as complex adaptive systems in which multiple interdependent forces interact non-linearly, making outcomes difficult to predict (Cameron & Green, 2019; Dawson, Eshleman, & Siemens, 2018). In such systems, disruption is not an exception but a constant reality. Institutional attempts to preserve stability through tighter control can unintentionally amplify stress (Openo & Robinson, 2021).

Internationalization is a major driver of this complexity, with rapid growth in international student enrollment (Buckner, Clerk, Marroquin, & Zhang, 2020; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2025). International graduate students bring diverse linguistic repertoires and socio-cultural identities, enriching classroom discourse while surfacing tensions related to access, equity, and support (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025; Kang & Metcalfe, 2019). International students document distinctive challenges related to language proficiency, financial insecurity, and navigating unfamiliar academic norms (Howe, Ramirez, & Walton, 2023; Torres-Arends, 2023). For many, higher education abroad is a multilayered encounter with new cultural norms and systems of power that shape belonging, trust, and opportunity (Glass & Westmont, 2014; Ploner, 2018).

Simultaneously, generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has rapidly altered academic work, raising new questions about authorship and ethical decision-making (Lund, Lee, Mannuru, & Arutla, 2025). GenAI tools are now readily accessible, offering students support with vocabulary, idea generation, and research strategy. Students, especially those writing in an additional language, may simultaneously experience these tools as resources and sources of risk, given uncertainty about when AI-assisted text constitutes misconduct. Because policy development has lagged technological change, students navigate AI-related decisions in a climate of ambiguity and surveillance (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022).

Research on international students and academic integrity underscores that breaches are frequently rooted in systemic and cultural misalignment rather than deliberate deception (Openo, 2019; Sanni-Anibire, Stoesz, Gervais, & Vogt, 2021; Torres-Arends, 2023). Many international students have been educated in systems with limited explicitly teaching about plagiarism, citation, or textual ownership (Openo, 2019; Ploner, 2018). In some contexts, practices such as collaborative test-taking or reusing an instructor's wording are normalized or actively encouraged (Niagara University Library, 2026; Torres-Arends, 2023). When these students enter Anglophone universities, they must rapidly adapt to a different understanding of authorship enforced through institutional policies and detection technologies (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022; Sanni-Anibire *et al.*, 2021). Studies indicate that international students often understand the concept of integrity yet fear accidental violations, describing policy environments as confusing and emotionally taxing, akin to "a field of landmines" (Sanni-Anibire *et al.*, 2021, p. 8).

Concurrently, scholars on academic hospitality have argued that institutions must move beyond transactional models of service toward relational practices of welcome, reciprocity, and ethical care (Phipps & Barnett, 2007; Rhoads, 2013). Bennett (2000) framed academic hospitality as an ethos of intellectual generosity in which everyday practices contribute to the transformation of both host and guest. Building on Derrida's philosophy of hospitality, later work emphasizes welcoming the other by relinquishing protective mechanisms and sharing space and knowledge in ways that decenter the host (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000; Imperiale, Phipps, & Fassetta, 2021). Phipps and Barnett (2007) present academic hospitality as a performative principle enacted through humility and the restraint of self-dominance over others. Empirical studies highlight that hospitable faculty behaviors—approachability, attentive listening, and vulnerability—are critical for fostering belonging and mitigating the stresses of cross-cultural academic adjustment (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025; Ploner, 2018).

System thinking suggests that academic hospitality and integrity are interdependent properties of institutional design (Cameron & Green, 2019; Dignan, 2019). Viewing universities as complex adaptive systems highlights how policies, pedagogies, and relational practices interact to shape students' sense of safety and ethical agency (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025; Dodge, Daly, Huyton, & Sanders, 2012). The VUCA Prime framework—vision, understanding, clarity, and agility—offers a leadership response by emphasizing clear, human-centered institutional purposes and unambiguous expectations (Freeman-Gray, n.d.; Hamakawa & Yamamoto, 2023). Within such a framework, academic hospitality creates spaces where students can bring their whole selves, while academic integrity is reconceptualized as a process of ethical formation intertwined with trust and compassion, particularly in relation to emerging AI technologies (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022; Glass & Westmont, 2014).

This article responds to these challenges by bringing together two complementary empirical studies conducted within a Canadian Master of Arts in Leadership program that enrolls a large majority of international graduate students. The first study examines academic hospitality and institutional support through a survey of 524 students. The second study investigates academic integrity and GenAI through an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design involving 153 pre-course surveys, 144 post-course surveys, six focus groups with 34 students, and 225 open-ended responses. Together, the studies offer a systems-level picture of how international students experience academic hospitality, integrity expectations, and AI-mediated learning within a single institutional ecosystem.

Guided by these frameworks, the article addresses the overarching research question: How can higher education institutions cultivate belonging, ethical formation, personal resilience, and institutional sustainability amid global complexity? To address this question, we pursue three specific aims: (1) to describe how international graduate students experience academic hospitality and institutional support; (2) to examine how targeted academic-integrity and AI-ethics instruction shapes students' confidence, knowledge, and practices; and (3) to propose a systems-oriented framework for designing hospitable, integrity-focused learning environments aligned with Sustainable Development Goals related to quality education, reduced inequalities, and strong institutions (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022; United Nations [UN], 2015).

Literature review

Higher education in a global VUCA context

Contemporary higher education is increasingly described through the lens of volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA), reflecting rapid geopolitical shifts, technological disruption, and social fragmentation (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025; Cameron & Green, 2019). Complexity science and chaos theory conceptualize universities as complex adaptive systems in which multiple interdependent forces interact non-linearly, making outcomes difficult to predict and control (Dawson *et al.*, 2018; Dignan, 2019; Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey, 2007). Rather than functioning as stable hierarchies, such systems exist in a state of ongoing disequilibrium, where disruption can generate both threat and opportunity (Dawson & Andriopoulos, 2021; Goldstein, 2021). These perspectives are valuable for leadership because they shift attention from prediction and control toward the conditions that enable learning, adaptability, resilience, and growth. In such environments, compassion becomes a critical leadership capacity, enabling leaders to respond to uncertainty, difference, and vulnerability with relational awareness and ethical care. Complexity Leadership Theory applies this insight by arguing that leaders in knowledge-based organizations should foster the relationships, networks, and enabling conditions through which new solutions and insights emerge (Kania & Kramer, 2013; Uhl-Bien *et al.*, 2007).

Internationalization is both a driver and a manifestation of this complexity, reflecting the ways institutions respond to global flows of students, knowledge, and educational opportunity (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Buckner *et al.*, 2020). Canadian universities had experienced substantial growth in international enrollment up to 2024, including in graduate leadership programs (ICEF Monitor, 2024; The Institute of International Education, 2023). However, critical perspectives on internationalization highlight that this growth is often driven by institutional financial imperatives and neoliberal policies, which risk reducing international students to economic commodities rather than valuing them as epistemic partners (Majee & Ress, 2020; Stein, 2021). International students bring diverse professional trajectories, linguistic repertoires, and socio-cultural identities, enriching classroom discourse while also introducing new tensions around access, equity, and support (Buckner *et al.*, 2020; Kang & Metcalfe, 2019). This dynamic creates a pronounced power asymmetry between Western host institutions and students predominantly from the Global South, complicating the idealized narratives of global education (Majee & Ress, 2020; Stein, 2021). Research on international students, particularly mature working professionals in Canada, documents challenges related to language proficiency, financial strain, housing, and unfamiliar academic norms (Beck & Ilieva, 2019; Howe *et al.*, 2023; Kang & Metcalfe, 2019), alongside increasingly negative public attitudes toward international student numbers (Environics Institute for Survey Research, 2024; Nanos Research, 2023). For many western countries that host international students, higher education is a multilayered experience in which academic demands conflict with immigration intentions and family obligations, producing a uniquely intense VUCA reality (Glass & Westmont, 2014; Torres-Arends, 2023).

VUCA Prime has been proposed as a leadership framework to counter these pressures, emphasizing vision, understanding, clarity, and agility as constructive responses to volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (Freeman-Gray, n.d.). In higher education, a VUCA Prime approach invites leaders to articulate a clear, whole-person vision of student flourishing, develop a deep understanding of students' backgrounds and constraints, provide conceptual and procedural clarity in policy and pedagogy, and remain agile in redesigning programs and support structures as conditions change (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025; Dignan, 2019). This perspective underpins the urgency for institutional designs that are not only efficient and innovative but also hospitable, ethical, and resilient.

Academic hospitality: ethics, leadership, and institutional ethos

The concept of academic hospitality offers a critical lens on how institutions welcome and host students amid global complexity. Bennett (2000) applied the metaphor of hospitality to the academic enterprise, framing intellectual life as a practice of offering and receiving observations and feedback in ways that can transform both host and guest. In this view, hospitality is not superficial politeness but a relational ethic in which educators cultivate climates of charity, reciprocity, and mutual growth.

Drawing on Derrida, subsequent scholarship has deepened this notion by emphasizing hospitality as an ethical paradox that centers on the guest rather than the host (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000). Derrida's treatment of unconditional hospitality focuses on relinquishing protective and controlling mechanisms, abandoning calculated reciprocity, and making oneself radically available to the other—a stance that is both aspirational and destabilizing in institutional settings (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000). This ethical stance has been further explored in higher education contexts, where scholars examine how such hospitality can be enacted through relational, embodied, and even virtual practices (Imperiale *et al.*, 2021). When applied to higher education, this ethic challenges faculty and leaders to reconsider how power, status, and knowledge are distributed, particularly in relation to students from marginalized or precarious contexts.

Phipps and Barnett (2007) build on these insights by presenting academic hospitality as a performative principle enacted through generosity and humility. Rhoads (2013) similarly interprets hospitality as a practice of preferring the other over oneself and creating relational spaces where both parties can be transformed. This approach positions hospitality not as customer service but as a leadership practice that leverages inclusion, mutuality, and care amid difference (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025).

Empirical studies about Canadian higher education suggest that international student experiences of hospitality are shaped by both national policy frameworks and local institutional cultures (Buckner *et al.*, 2020). The Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1985) articulates commitments to diversity, equal opportunity, and the removal of barriers, providing a legislative backdrop for inclusive practices (Brosseau & Dewing, 2018). Despite Canada's national inclusive policies, students' lived experiences depend greatly on their daily interactions with faculty, staff, and peers. For instance, students place high value on faculty who create safe and welcoming environments, listen attentively, are approachable, and model humility and vulnerability (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025).

At the organizational level, hospitality manifests through coordinated acculturation services, academic support structures, and well-being resources tailored to international students' needs (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Mendis & Currie, 2020). Universities that provide pre-departure orientation, flexible coursework structures, language and writing support, and comprehensive counseling services demonstrate a more holistic understanding of hosting (Howe *et al.*, 2023). These practices align with Expressive Change and "inscaping" approaches, which emphasize organizations that prioritize process and being over performance and doing and encourage members to bring their whole selves into shared work (Nilsson & Paddock, 2013, 2014). In the context of international graduate education, such hospitable ecosystems can mitigate the disorienting effects of VUCA conditions and create spaces for students to move from survival to flourishing (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025; Glass & Westmont, 2014).

International students, academic integrity, and cultural transitions

Research on international students and academic integrity consistently shows that breaches often arise from systemic and cultural misalignment rather than intentional fraud (Sanni-Anibire *et al.*, 2021; Torres-Arends, 2023). Often students come from educational systems that emphasize rote learning, high-stakes examinations, and teacher-centered instruction, with limited explicit education about Western conventions of plagiarism, citation, or authorship (Openo, 2019; Ploner, 2018). Scholarship on academic writing across cultural and educational systems suggests that Western conventions of individual textual ownership are culturally situated rather than shared across all educational traditions. When rigidly enforced, these conventions may wrongly interpret students' practices in contexts where memory, imitation, shared knowledge, or respectful reproduction of authoritative texts carry different educational meanings (Chandrasoma, Thompson, & Pennycook, 2004; Pennycook, 1996; Scollon, 1995).

In some contexts, practices such as collaborative test-taking, reusing instructors' wording as a sign of respect, or relying heavily on translation tools are described as normal or even encouraged (Niagara University Library, 2026; Torres-Arends, 2023). When these students enter Western universities, they encounter more institutionalized integrity protocols characterized by detection technologies and culturally specific expectations regarding paraphrasing and textual ownership (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022; Sanni-Anibire *et al.*, 2021).

Studies in Anglophone higher education systems indicate that international students typically understand the importance of integrity yet fear accidental violations due to ambiguous or unfamiliar rules. Furthermore, traditional approaches to academic integrity are frequently rooted in mechanisms of institutional control and surveillance, such as plagiarism detection software. These systems distribute power unevenly, often embedding a presumption

of suspicion that can produce guilt, shame, and anxiety while disproportionately monitoring international students rather than supporting their development (Introna & Hayes, 2011; Macfarlane, 2017). Recent research characterizes international students' experiences of academic integrity policies as akin to "walking in a field of landmines" (Sanni-Anibire *et al.*, 2021, p. 8), thus expressing their apprehension that minor citation errors or awkward paraphrases could carry severe academic or immigration consequences (Torres-Arends, 2023). This anxiety is compounded when non-English speaking students negotiate culturally different understandings of authority, and adapt to new assessment procedures that assume prior familiarity with citation styles such as APA (Glass & Westmont, 2014; Openo, 2019).

Qualitative and mixed-methods studies underscore the emotional and relational dimensions of integrity for international students. Feelings of fear, shame, confusion, and isolation frequently accompany academic writing tasks, notably when students are unsure whether their efforts will be interpreted as honest or deceptive (Openo & Robinson, 2021). Research connecting integrity with belonging suggests that students' sense of fair treatment and trust in institutional processes is tightly coupled with their relational experiences of inclusion and care (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022; Rhoads, 2013). When integrity is framed primarily as a compliance requirement policed through punitive mechanisms, it may exacerbate students' vulnerability and erode their trust in these institutional mechanisms. Conversely, when institutions embed integrity education within supportive teaching and mentoring relationships, students are more likely to perceive integrity as integral to their identity as emerging leaders (Glass & Westmont, 2014).

Recent scholarship has argued that academic integrity should be reconceptualized as a leadership and equity issue rather than as a narrow rule-enforcement problem (Buckner *et al.*, 2020; Openo, 2019). Eaton and Christensen Hughes (2022), for example, call for campus-wide approaches that treat integrity as a shared institutional and cultural responsibility, emphasizing the need for clear policies, coherent communication, and equitable support for students who arrive with divergent educational mindsets. This perspective resonates with broader equity frameworks in Canadian higher education, which highlight the importance of recognizing systemic exclusion and designing support structures that account for the compound vulnerabilities many international students face (Brosseau & Dewing, 2018; Buckner *et al.*, 2020; Kang & Metcalfe, 2019).

Generative AI, integrity, and ethical formation

The rapid emergence of generative AI tools, including large-language models, has added a new layer of complexity to academic integrity. For international graduate students, these tools function simultaneously as lifelines and sources of risk. On the one hand, AI applications promise support with vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, idea generation, and even research strategy, potentially alleviating some of the linguistic and cognitive pressures of writing in a second language and supporting postgraduate research processes when used with critical oversight (Dai, Lai, Lim, & Liu, 2023). This interaction can be understood through the lens of cognitive offloading—using AI to handle lower-order language mechanics so that students can free up working memory to engage in higher-order critical thinking and subject mastery (Risko & Gilbert, 2016). However, a critical tension exists between beneficial cognitive offloading and the detrimental outsourcing of learning, since GenAI can produce assessment artefacts without demonstrating student learning and may thereby bypass students' own intellectual engagement and skill development (Lodge, Thompson, & Corrin, 2023). For this reason, AI-assisted learning requires scholarly scrutiny, since fluent outputs may still be biased, contextually insensitive, or insufficiently grounded (Brown & Rossouw, 2026).

A further risk is that GenAI blurs boundaries between legitimate assistance and misconduct, raising questions about authorship, voice, and appropriate acknowledgment of AI usage in ways that intensify older debates about textual ownership, intertextuality, and the cultural meanings attached to intertextual practices, such as reusing language, echoing

authoritative texts, or closely following established formulations (Chandrasoma *et al.*, 2004; Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022; Pennycook, 1996; Scollon, 1995).

Recent studies indicate that students tend to be unsure when AI-assisted text becomes plagiarism, how to cite AI outputs, or whether using AI for tasks such as paraphrasing or extensive AI-assisted revision will be perceived as cheating (Lund *et al.*, 2025). Policy development in many institutions has lagged the adoption of AI technologies, leaving students to navigate AI-related decisions in what they perceive as a climate of uncertainty and risk (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022; Sanni-Anibire *et al.*, 2021). Some students respond by over-relying on AI in secretive ways, particularly for generating or rewriting text, while others avoid AI entirely out of fear of detection, even when its use might be pedagogically appropriate. This fear is acutely amplified by the institutional deployment of AI detection tools. Recent research shows that both human judgment and automated detection remain unreliable in identifying AI-generated or AI-altered text as detection tools can misclassify original writing by non-native English speakers as AI-generated (Kofinas, Tsay, & Pike, 2025; Liang, Yuksekgonul, Mao, Wu, & Zou, 2023). Such automated surveillance exacerbates the power imbalances and anxiety already experienced by international students and introduces new elements into the academic integrity ecosystem.

Studies of instructional intervention suggest that explicit AI literacy and ethics instruction, integrated into course design, can shift student practices toward more ethical and learning-oriented uses. When instructors distinguish acceptable uses (e.g. brainstorming, grammar checking, outlining) from unacceptable uses (e.g. generating full assignments, fabricating sources), and when they discuss AI expectations and detection tools transparently, students report increased clarity and ethical confidence (Lund *et al.*, 2025).

These findings underscore that AI is not only a technical or policy issue but also a well-being and leadership concern. Students' anxiety about falsely detected AI usage, their fear of being misclassified as dishonest, and their uncertainty about instructors' expectations have significant implications for trust and mental health (Glass & Westmont, 2014). Addressing AI in higher education therefore requires not only clear rules but also relational and institutional practices that help students develop ethical agency, reflexive learning, and responsible human judgment in AI-augmented environments (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022). Similar concerns regarding ethical reflection, relational learning, and integrity in AI-mediated higher education environments have also been identified within a Global South context, such as South African universities (Brown & Rossouw, 2026; McKenna, 2025).

Systems thinking, SDGs, and institutional design

Bringing together scholarship on VUCA contexts, academic hospitality, integrity, and AI points toward a systems-thinking approach to institutional design (Meadows, 2008; Senge, 1990). Systems thinking invites leaders to see how policies, curricula, assessment structures, support services, and classroom relationships interact to shape students' experiences of welcome, fairness, and ethical formation. From this perspective, isolated interventions—a single online integrity module, an ad hoc AI policy, or a one-off orientation session—are unlikely to produce sustainable change if they are not embedded in coherent, hospitable systems (Cameron & Green, 2019; Dignan, 2019).

The United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) provide a useful global framework for situating such institutional work (UN, 2015). SDG 4 (Quality Education) emphasizes inclusive, equitable, and relevant learning opportunities across the life course (UN, n.d.a), while SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities) calls for removing structural barriers that prevent full participation in social and economic life (UN, n.d.b). SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions) highlights the importance of accountable, transparent, and trustworthy institutions (UN, n.d.c). For universities, these goals translate into obligations to provide rigorous yet accessible education, reduce inequities experienced by international students and model ethical governance and integrity in their own practices.

The SDG framework is most useful for higher education when translated into concrete redesign of curricula, assessment, and student-support systems that embody its values (UN, 2015). In the context of international graduate education, this includes designing courses that explicitly teach integrity and AI literacy, creating hospitable environments that address both academic and non-academic challenges, and ensuring that policies are transparent, culturally responsive, and consistently applied. Leadership frameworks such as VUCA Prime can help guide these redesign efforts by focusing institutional attention on vision, understanding, clarity, and agility in the face of ongoing disruption (Freeman-Gray, n.d.; Hamakawa & Yamamoto, 2023).

Taken together, the literature suggests that international students' experiences of academic hospitality, integrity, and AI cannot be meaningfully addressed in isolation. They are interwoven within complex institutional systems shaped by global forces, national policy, and local leadership practices. This integrated perspective motivates the present study's focus on how one Canadian graduate leadership program has sought to respond to global complexity with institutional compassion, and how academic hospitality and integrity education function as complementary strategies for cultivating belonging, ethical formation, and resilience among international graduate students.

Methodology

Research context

This research was conducted in a private university in Western Canada, hosting one of the largest Master of Arts in Leadership programs in North America, with a student population approaching 1,400 students at its peak. The research aimed to generate analytically useful insights about one institutional ecosystem rather than to offer statistically generalizable claims across all higher education environments. This bounded context is a key strength of the research design, allowing the two studies to be interpreted together as connected, systemic views of the same institutional environment. The program enrolled a large number of international students from more than 25 countries, with strong representation from East and South Asia, the Middle East, and sub-Saharan Africa. Students were typically early- or mid-career professionals pursuing business, education, or healthcare leadership streams, and many had already held at least one prior master's degree.

The program operates within Canada's constitutional framework of multiculturalism, which aspires to equal participation amid diversity and shapes institutional commitments to inclusion and hospitality (Brosseau & Dewing, 2018; Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1985). Even so, international students in the program navigate volatile conditions in their countries of origin, shifting Canadian immigration and work-permit regulations (Government of Canada, 2025; Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2024a, 2024b), high housing costs, and competing family obligations, all of which interact with the demands of graduate study (Couture, 2025; Harden-Wolfson, Hutcheson, & Zhang, 2025; Hoxhaj, Muharremi, & Aarif, 2025). These contextual factors informed the design of both the hospitality and integrity studies and provide essential background for interpreting their findings.

Overall design

This article synthesizes findings from two related but distinct empirical studies:

- (1) Study 1: Academic hospitality survey – a non-experimental, quantitative descriptive study using a web-based survey to examine international students' experiences of academic hospitality, non-academic challenges, and perceptions of faculty behaviors.
- (2) Study 2: Academic integrity and AI study – an explanatory sequential mixed-methods study using a follow-up explanations design (Plano Clark & Creswell, 2014) to investigate changes in students' academic-integrity confidence, knowledge, and

The studies were conducted within a 10-month timeframe, with Study 1 focusing on the broader program environment and Study 2 concentrating on one mandatory research methodology course. Because both examined international students' experiences of hospitality, integrity, and institutional support in the same program, their findings can be read together as complementary perspectives on a single complex system. Taken together, the two studies were not intended to establish broad causal claims across higher education settings; rather, they were designed to generate an integrated, contextually situated account of how academic hospitality, academic integrity, and AI-related learning intersect within one institutional ecosystem.

Study 1: academic hospitality survey

Design and participants. Study 1 employed a non-experimental, quantitative descriptive design (Plano Clark & Creswell, 2014) to explore how international students perceived academic hospitality and institutional support. Inclusion criteria specified that participants be: (1) international students, (2) enrolled in a MA Leadership program, (3) studying face-to-face, and (4) beyond their first semester of study. Domestic students, students in a non-English program, fully online students, and alumni were excluded.

Using a convenience sampling strategy, the research team invited eligible students to complete a survey on a secure online platform. While this non-probabilistic convenience approach limits broad generalizability across all higher education contexts, the resulting sample of 524 respondents represented 38.5% of the program's entire international student population at the time of data collection. This response ratio was achieved through widespread faculty support, with instructors across the program actively encouraging participation. Because respondents were drawn from courses taught by many different instructors, the data capture a broad, cross-sectional view of the institutional ecosystem rather than reflecting the pedagogical practices of a single classroom. Consequently, the sample provides a credible and representative descriptive picture of this specific institutional population. The final sample comprised 524 respondents, representing 26 countries, with the largest cohorts from China, India, and Iran. The majority of participants identified as females (77.8%), were in the 25–34 age range (57.0%), and were early- or mid-career professionals.

Instrument. The survey instrument contained 45 close-ended questions organized into seven sections: demographics, experiences with administrative processes, cultural awareness and experiences, non-academic factors affecting learning, academic hospitality, faculty interactions, and general feedback. Items were designed to capture:

- (1) Perceptions of cultural hospitality, defined as experiences characterized by consideration, compassion, friendliness, and tolerance.
- (2) Evaluations of faculty behaviors related to safety, welcome, professionalism, humility, and vulnerability.
- (3) Non-academic challenges such as financial pressures, housing, transportation, family obligations, part-time work, and immigration concerns.

Items were predominantly Likert-type scales assessing the degree of importance or frequency of specific experiences. The instrument was developed drawing on leadership and cultural-dimensions literature, including humane-orientation constructs from the GLOBE study (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). To ensure content validity, the instrument and selected items were reviewed prior to distribution by researchers and faculty familiar with international student learning and higher education practice. Reviewers assessed the items for clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study aims. Following this validation process, the final instrument was reviewed and approved through the university's research ethics process.

Procedures and analysis. Participants were recruited with invitations sent through the university's internal communication channels, and reminders were issued to maximize response rates. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. No course credit or financial compensation was offered.

Quantitative data were exported from a web-based survey tool and analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) to characterize the sample and summarize key patterns in perceptions of hospitality, faculty behaviors, and challenges. Given the study's primary purpose of descriptive institutional mapping and its use of a convenience sample, the analysis was intentionally designed to map broad patterns of experience within this localized setting rather than to support inferential statistical generalization beyond it. Therefore, inferential analysis was not part of the research design. Analyses focused on identifying high-frequency faculty behaviors, salient non-academic stressors, and indicators of institutional hospitality as experienced on a continuum from strong to insufficient. These results later informed the interpretation of the integrity study by providing a broader map of the students' academic context.

Study 2: academic integrity and AI study

Design and participants. Study 2, a subsequent study, used an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design to examine how intentional, course-embedded instruction influenced international students' integrity confidence, knowledge, and AI-related practices. The study took place in a six-week-long research methodology course, a core course typically taken in students' first or second term. All four sections of the research foundations course during the study period followed a common syllabus, assessment structure, and set of academic-integrity learning outcomes, and all instructors used the same research instruments and recruitment procedures, thus increasing procedural consistency across all participants.

In total, 153 students completed the pre-course survey. Of these, 144 completed the post-course survey in Week 6, and 34 participated in follow-up focus groups after the course concluded. English was an additional language for most students, and many reported prior educational experiences emphasizing memorization, high-stakes examinations, and teacher-centered instruction with limited explicit attention to citation or plagiarism, commonly identified in existing literature (Openo, 2019; Ploner, 2018).

Instrument. The quantitative phase used parallel pre- and post-course online surveys, administered through a secure online platform. The pre-course survey gathered demographic information as well as prior educational experiences, such as:

- (1) Perceived difficulty of key academic-writing tasks (e.g. understanding what plagiarism means in Canada, citing sources properly, paraphrasing, using APA formatting correctly) on a 5-point scale from "not difficult at all" to "very difficult."
- (2) Self-reported use of AI tools for grammar/spelling, rewriting, brainstorming, and related purposes.
- (3) Knowledge-check vignettes assessing recognition of plagiarism and AI misuse.

The post-course survey mirrored the pre-course structure but assessed confidence instead of difficulty on the same skills (using a 5-point scale from "not confident at all" to "very confident"), repeated the knowledge-check vignettes, and added items about AI attitudes and uses (e.g. agreement with statements such as "Using AI to generate citations is always allowed" and "Paraphrasing a paragraph without citation is acceptable if you use your own words"). Open-ended questions invited students to describe the most significant ways their understanding of academic integrity and AI changed and what academic support they perceived as still needed.

The qualitative phase used semi-structured focus-group protocols aligned with the survey domains (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Prompts invited participants to discuss:

- (1) How academic integrity was approached in their home countries.
- (2) How they used AI tools before and during the course (e.g. for grammar, translation, rewriting, brainstorming).
- (3) How their confidence and understanding of integrity and AI evolved over the six weeks.
- (4) Which instructional strategies and supports were most or least helpful.

Data collection and analysis. Data collection spanned a six-week offering of a research foundations course. In Week 1, instructors posted the pre-survey link in the learning-management system and provided in-class reminders. In Week 6, an analogous process was used for the post-survey. Participation was voluntary, anonymous, and had no bearing on course grades. After preliminary survey analysis, the research team invited a purposive subsample of students to join focus groups, aiming for diversity in region of origin, language background, self-reported confidence levels, and AI use. A trained research assistant who was not an instructor of record facilitated all focus groups to minimize power dynamics and encourage candid discussion ([Openo, 2019](#); [Torres-Arends, 2023](#)).

Quantitative survey data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and pre-post comparisons of response distributions across six academic-integrity domains: understanding plagiarism, citing sources properly, paraphrasing, using APA formatting correctly, evaluating source reliability, and using AI tools ethically. Analyses tracked shifts from low (1–2) to high (4–5) responses for each skill and calculated changes in the percentage of correct answers on plagiarism and AI-misuse knowledge-check items. Because the surveys were administered anonymously in a course-embedded educational context, and the study was designed primarily for practice-based qualitative inquiry and pedagogical improvement, the quantitative analysis emphasized the magnitude and direction of descriptive change patterns rather than participant-level inferential testing. The magnitude of change, often involving 20–30 percentage-point gains in high-confidence or correct-knowledge categories, was interpreted in light of prior intervention studies on academic integrity ([Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022](#); [Sanni-Anibire et al., 2021](#)).

Qualitative data from open-ended survey responses and focus-group transcripts were analyzed thematically ([Braun & Clarke, 2006](#)). The research team first read all text to become familiar with the data and then coded segments inductively to identify recurring patterns related to prior educational experiences, policy enforcement, emotional responses (e.g. fear, shame, confidence), use of AI and technology, and evolving understandings of plagiarism, citation, and critical thinking. These codes were then organized into broader themes, including differences in policy enforcement, cultural attitudes toward academic integrity, familiarity with APA and citation, use of AI, and limited early education on integrity. The explanatory sequential design meant that qualitative themes were used to interpret and deepen the meaning of survey patterns, especially where large quantitative shifts required contextualization ([Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018](#); [Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016](#)).

Ethical considerations

Both studies received approval from the university’s research ethics board prior to data collection. Participation was voluntary in all phases, and informed consent was obtained from every respondent and focus-group participant. Survey responses were anonymous; instructors could see only aggregate counts, not individual answers. Focus-group data were anonymized through the use of pseudonyms and the removal of potentially identifying details in transcripts and quotations. Particular attention was paid to the ethical management of data related to AI use, academic integrity incidents, and student vulnerability, given the potential consequences for immigration status and academic standing.

Findings

Study 1: academic hospitality in a VUCA context

Non-academic challenges and VUCA realities. Survey results from 524 international graduate students revealed that participants experienced a convergence of non-academic stressors that shaped their engagement with the program. Students reported significant volatility linked to events in their countries of origin, such as geopolitical tension, economic instability, and family crises, which often competed with academic priorities. Many described rapidly changing Canadian immigration and work-permit regulations, high housing costs, and transportation difficulties as additional sources of uncertainty and complexity in their daily lives.

These compounding pressures were not experienced as peripheral to participants' academic work but as integral to their capacity to focus, persist, and participate fully in the learning environment. Survey items focusing on family and community responsibilities highlighted that obligations to geographically distant relatives remained central, frequently requiring students to navigate conflicting demands between academic deadlines and urgent responsibilities at home. The data suggest that students' personal VUCA worlds—shaped by cross-border financial commitments, visa concerns, and caregiving roles—formed a constant backdrop to their graduate studies.

Perceptions of social behaviors and faculty interactions. Within this context, students' experiences of hospitality were strongly linked to everyday social behaviors and faculty interactions. When asked to rate the importance of various relational behaviors, participants emphasized non-verbal friendliness and simple greetings (even among strangers) as the most valued forms of social engagement, reflecting cultural expectations common in many Global South contexts. These seemingly small gestures were interpreted as signs of care and inclusion, helping to counteract feelings of isolation and dislocation.

Questions about faculty interactions yielded similarly clear patterns. Across the sample, students highly valued faculty who created a safe and welcoming environment, listened attentively, were approachable, and modeled professionalism, humility, and vulnerability. These ratings indicate that international students saw faculty not only as content experts but also as key agents of academic hospitality and emotional safety. Many respondents implicitly contrasted such behaviors with experiences in previous educational systems where teacher-student relationships were more hierarchical and distant, or where personal questions or informal interactions were rare. These contrasts suggest that academic hospitality actively aids in the cultural transition by establishing the psychological safety required for rigorous academic engagement.

Institutional supports and areas of need. The survey also explored students' experiences with cultural-adjustment, academic services, and well-being services available at the university. Participants recognized and appreciated a range of existing resources, including international student services for immigration and housing, language and writing support and access to counseling and well-being resources on campus.

Nonetheless, students identified continuing barriers. Academic difficulties related to differences in teaching methods, assessment expectations, and citation standards emerged as substantial challenges for those educated in systems where rote learning and exams predominated.

Taken together, the hospitality findings depict a student population navigating intense external and internal pressures while relying heavily on relational cues and institutional support to determine whether the university is a place of mere tolerance or genuine welcome. Students' positive ratings of faculty behaviors and existing services suggest that many hospitable practices are already in place, yet their reported challenges underscore the need for deeper, systemic forms of academic hospitality that address both academic and non-academic dimensions of their experience. To move beyond fragmented support, institutional systems must explicitly link academic expectations with compassionate care.

Study 2: academic integrity, AI, and ethical formation

Pre-course confidence, knowledge, and emotions. At the outset of the mandatory research methodology course, pre-survey data from 153 international students painted a picture of low confidence and partial knowledge across key academic-integrity skills. Over 60% of respondents rated understanding “what plagiarism means in Canada” and citing a source properly as highly difficult, and similar proportions reported significant difficulty with paraphrasing and using APA formatting correctly. Knowledge-check items revealed gaps in students’ ability to correctly identify plagiarism and AI citation misuse; only 63% correctly recognized clear cases of plagiarism and only 48% correctly identified improper citation of AI-generated text.

Qualitative responses corroborated these quantitative patterns. When asked about their biggest fears or challenges related to academic writing, students repeatedly cited anxiety about unintentional plagiarism and difficulty mastering APA 7. Several have described academic writing in Canada as “walking in a field of landmines,” fearing that even sincere efforts to paraphrase might still be interpreted as copying. This exact metaphor echoes the findings of [Sanni-Anibire et al. \(2021\)](#), who observed the same sentiment among international students navigating academic integrity at other Canadian higher education institutions. Other participants noted that academic language and citation conventions felt like “a completely different language,” compounding the challenge of writing in English as an additional language.

Students also reported confusion about AI. Many had used AI tools for grammar checking, rewriting, or brainstorming, but were unsure which uses were acceptable and how to acknowledge AI support. Some admitted to avoiding AI entirely out of fear that any use might be deemed cheating, while others described privately relying on AI for substantial rewriting tasks, recognizing the risks but feeling driven by pressure to meet institutional expectations.

Pre-course integrity landscapes and prior systems. Open-ended pre-survey responses and early focus-group discussions highlighted stark differences between students’ prior educational systems and Canada’s academic integrity environment. Many participants reported that in their home countries, academic integrity policies were either weakly enforced, inconsistently applied, or conceptualized differently. Practices such as collaborative test-taking, reusing instructors’ wording as a sign of respect, or relying heavily on translation tools were described as normal or even encouraged. Explicit teaching about plagiarism and citation was often minimal or absent, and plagiarism-detection software or AI policies were rarely part of their previous academic experience.

Students also referenced broader systemic issues, including perceptions of corruption, transactional approaches to education, and exclusion based on socio-economic status or proximity to power, which had shaped their trust in academic institutions. Against this backdrop, they perceived the more formalized and punitive integrity systems in Canadian universities as necessary yet unsettling. Participants described an “enforcement gap” in which they had to rapidly adapt from loosely enforced or differently conceptualized norms to a highly monitored, policy-driven environment that at times felt adversarial rather than developmental.

Post-course shifts in confidence and knowledge. Following six weeks of embedded instruction on academic integrity and AI ethics, post-survey data from 144 students showed substantial gains across all measured domains. Confidence distributions shifted dramatically from the low to high ends of the scale. For understanding plagiarism in Canada, low-confidence responses dropped from 62.0% to 4.9%, while high-confidence responses increased from 16.7% to 90.9%. Comparable patterns emerged for citing sources properly and paraphrasing in one’s own words, where high-confidence responses rose to nearly 90% or above.

Confidence in using APA formatting correctly, evaluating source reliability, and ethically using AI tools also showed significant shifts toward the high end of the scale. Knowledge-check outcomes echoed this transformation: correct identification of plagiarism increased from 63% to 92%, and correct recognition of AI citation misuse rose from 48% to

85%. The proportion of “not sure” responses decreased correspondingly, suggesting that students had gained not only familiarity but also clarity about how integrity rules apply in concrete situations.

Changes in AI use and ethical reasoning. The surveys also documented notable changes in how students used AI tools. Before the course, the most common uses included grammar/spelling checking, brainstorming ideas, and rewriting text. After the course, reported use of AI for rewriting dropped sharply, while use for brainstorming increased; grammar/spelling support decreased slightly but remained common. This pattern suggests a shift away from higher-risk uses that blur authorship toward more learning-oriented, generative uses, aligning with course guidance.

Qualitative post-course responses further illustrated a reorientation in students’ ethical reasoning. Many described AI as a “bounded learning partner” rather than as a shortcut, emphasizing uses that supported idea generation, language refinement, and planning without substituting for their own thinking. Students also reported greater awareness of when and how AI use must be disclosed, and increased skepticism about over-reliance on AI for text production.

Nevertheless, concerns and anxieties persisted. Participants expressed concern about AI-detection tools misclassifying their original writing, especially when their linguistic patterns differed from those of native English speakers. This finding underscores the vulnerability international students experience when encountering Western academic integrity norms in environments increasingly shaped by AI-powered tools, particularly amid differing communication expectations. Others noted ongoing confusion about varying AI expectations across different courses and instructors, underscoring the importance of coherent, program-wide guidance on student AI use.

Mindset shifts: integrity as leadership and well-being. The most significant transformation documented in the qualitative data was a shift in how students conceptualized academic integrity itself. Pre-course narratives framed integrity primarily as a set of rules and threats—something to avoid violating in order to prevent punishment or jeopardizing academic and immigration status. By the end of the course, many students described integrity as “not just about avoiding plagiarism but about honesty, responsibility, and respect in all scholarly work,” and explicitly linked it to their emerging identities as leaders.

Students reported reduced fear and increased confidence, describing the course as a space where they could ask “awkward questions” without judgment, and where faculty mentorship, scaffolded tasks, and targeted workshops together created a supportive learning environment. Several participants emphasized that the course helped them “do more work by myself,” rely less on hidden AI use, and understand the rationale behind citation and paraphrasing expectations. Integrity instruction, in this sense, shifted from a compliance exercise to a process of ethical formation, adaptive capacity, and self-efficacy development.

Students also identified ongoing needs, including more practice with paraphrasing and synthesis, continued support with APA 7, clearer institutional AI guidelines, and program-long reinforcement of integrity concepts beyond a single course. These comments suggest that while a short, intensive intervention can catalyze significant gains, sustaining those gains requires systemic, longitudinal support.

Integrated view: hospitality, integrity, and systems. Taken together, the two studies suggest that international graduate students’ experiences of academic hospitality and integrity are deeply interconnected in a complex institutional system. The hospitality survey highlights how students’ personal VUCA realities and non-academic challenges intersect with their perceptions of faculty behaviors and institutional support, revealing a strong dependence on relational safety and welcome. The integrity study shows that when academic expectations and AI ethics are taught explicitly within a hospitable, leadership-oriented environment, students can move rapidly from fear and uncertainty toward ethical clarity, confidence, and a leadership-based understanding of integrity. These outcomes demonstrate that academic

integrity and academic hospitality are increasingly prominent elements for navigating the contemporary complexities of Anglophone higher education systems.

These findings set the stage for a discussion of how higher education institutions might intentionally design systems—curricula, assessment practices, support structures, and leadership cultures—that respond to global complexity not only with control mechanisms but also with compassion, relational clarity, and structures that support diversity, equity, and belonging.

Discussion

From compliance to hospitality-infused integrity

The two studies together suggest that international graduate students' struggles with academic integrity cannot be adequately addressed through compliance-oriented policies alone; they must be understood within broader experiences of hospitality, vulnerability, and systemic VUCA pressures (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025). Survey data show that students navigate complex non-academic challenges—volatile conditions in their home countries, shifting immigration rules, financial strain, and family obligations—that create a persistent background of instability even before academic expectations are considered (Brosseau & Dewing, 2018; Howe *et al.*, 2023). Within this context, faculty behaviors that convey safety, attentiveness, and humility function as core elements of academic hospitality, shaping whether students experience the university as a place of welcome or as another field of risk (Buckner *et al.*, 2020; Phipps & Barnett, 2007). These relational behaviors are not peripheral qualities; they are part of the essential enabling conditions for ethical learning.

The integrity study demonstrates that when academic norms and AI use expectations are embedded within such a hospitable environment, students can rapidly transition from fear to ethical agency. Quantitative gains in confidence and knowledge are striking, but perhaps more important is the qualitative shift from viewing integrity as a minefield of punishable errors to understanding it as part of one's character and leadership identity. This transformation aligns with scholarship that frames integrity as a shared institutional responsibility and as a dimension of professional ethics rather than merely a student-level problem (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022; Gibson & Eamer, 2025; Openo, 2019).

From a systems thinking perspective, hospitality and integrity are not isolated initiatives but rather interconnected components that produce mutually reinforcing emergent properties within a learning ecosystem (Christensen Hughes, 2024). Hospitable relationships and robust support structures act as essential enabling conditions, establishing the psychological safety necessary for students to admit confusion, ask "awkward questions," and practice new skills without debilitating fear. This sense of safety generates a positive feedback loop. When students feel secure enough to engage authentically, they are better positioned to ask questions, seek guidance, and participate honestly. In turn, robust academic integrity education, especially when it includes AI literacy, equips them to navigate complex academic expectations with greater confidence and adaptability (Oldham, 2025). Consequently, students can participate more fully and confidently in the academic community that hospitality has opened to them, fostering a resilient systemic environment where both learner development and rigorous academic standards thrive (Lund *et al.*, 2025).

VUCA Prime leadership and institutional resilience

Interpreted through the VUCA Prime lens, the findings highlight several leadership imperatives. Vision is evident when institutions articulate a clear purpose that goes beyond credentialing to emphasize holistic formation, ethical leadership, and global citizenship; students in both studies expressed a desire for purposeful growth rather than mere compliance (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025; Glass & Westmont, 2014). Understanding requires leaders to take seriously international students' diverse histories, including prior educational norms

around collaboration, textual ownership, and system-level corruption (Openo, 2019; Torres-Arends, 2023).

Clarity emerges as a central need in both hospitality and integrity contexts. Students asked for clearer expectations around paraphrasing, citation, and AI use, as well as more transparent communication about available supports and institutional processes (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022; Sanni-Anibire *et al.*, 2021). Ambiguous or unwritten rules exacerbate anxiety and increase the likelihood of unintentional breaches. Agility is demonstrated when programs redesign courses, assessments, and support systems in response to emerging challenges, such as GenAI tools or changing immigration landscapes, rather than relying on static policies (Freeman-Gray, n.d.).

By embodying the VUCA Prime qualities—vision, understanding, clarity, and agility—higher education leaders can move their institutions from reactive, control-oriented postures toward more resilient, learning-oriented systems that are better equipped to support international students' flourishing (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025; Dignan, 2019). The present findings suggest that these practices are particularly relevant in higher education institutions enrolling large numbers of international graduate students navigating complexity and adaptability.

Alignment with SDGs: quality, equity, and strong institutions

The integrated findings also speak directly to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). For SDG 4 (Quality Education), the integrity study illustrates that quality cannot be reduced to content coverage or technical skills; it must include equitable access to the tacit rules of academic participation. When universities assume that students already know how to cite, paraphrase, and use AI appropriately, they inadvertently reduce educational quality for those whose prior systems did not teach these norms (Openo, 2019; Ploner, 2018). Course-embedded instruction that yields large gains in confidence and knowledge reflects a more SDG-aligned conception of quality education: rigorous, explicit, and accessible (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022).

With respect to SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities), the hospitality survey underscores how structural factors—immigration policies, housing costs, and family obligations—intersect with academic expectations to produce uneven burdens on international students (Brosseau & Dewing, 2018; Howe *et al.*, 2023). Reducing inequalities in this context means not only opening access but also redesigning supports, assessments, and policies so that diverse students can participate on equitable terms (Beck & Ilieva, 2019).

SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions) is implicated in how universities govern integrity and AI use. Institutions that rely primarily on surveillance and punishment risk eroding trust and modeling forms of governance that feel arbitrary or opaque (Sanni-Anibire *et al.*, 2021). By contrast, the integrity intervention in this study illustrates how transparent expectations, dialogic learning about AI, and hospitable pedagogy can strengthen trust and cultivate future leaders who understand integrity as a core dimension of just and accountable institutions (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022). However, students' persistent anxiety about plagiarism detection and AI misclassification indicates that institutional clarity is also a question of power and perceived fairness, highlighting the need for critical attention to how monitoring systems are experienced by international students.

Empirical findings from this Canadian study, together with doctoral-level research within South African university contexts, suggest that future learning and educational innovation require institutional governance frameworks capable of cultivating ethically discerning graduates who engage responsibly with knowledge generation, and increasingly complex information ecosystems (Brown & Rossouw, 2026; McKenna, 2025).

Practical implications for leaders and faculty

The findings point to several practical implications. First, academic integrity and AI ethics should be treated as central components of leadership education and student well-being, not as

peripheral orientation topics or compliance modules but as formative capacities that equip students to navigate uncertainty, complexity, and ethical decision-making with adaptability and discernment (Gibson & Eamer, 2025). Second, academic hospitality must extend beyond initial welcomes to include ongoing, materially supported practices that address non-academic challenges, relational safety, and cultural transition through leadership approaches characterized by curiosity, attentiveness, and relational awareness (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025). Third, institutional policies on AI, assessment, and integrity need to be coherent across programs, clearly communicated, and developed with input from international students who experience their impacts most acutely, recognizing that complexity requires facilitative leadership, systems awareness, and responsiveness to diverse student realities (Lund *et al.*, 2025; Torres-Arends, 2023).

Limitations

Several limitations contextualize the findings of this research and highlight areas for future inquiry. First, both empirical studies were conducted within a single graduate leadership program at a Western Canadian university, utilizing a convenience sampling approach. While this bounded context allowed for a deep, systems-level exploration of one specific institutional ecosystem, the sample is not probabilistically representative. However, a distinct methodological strength of this sample is its exceptional global diversity and its substantial respondent base. The participant pool represents over 35 countries and offers a highly comprehensive cross-section of the Global South, with representation across major global regions, capturing voices from regions that are historically underrepresented in Western higher education research, such as Mongolia and Bhutan. This unique global demographic composition provides rare, empirically grounded insights into how academic hospitality and integrity are experienced by an international, non-Western student population. Consequently, the findings represent an analytically informative case study rather than a universally applicable model, and care should be taken not to overgeneralize these insights.

Second, the quantitative analyses in Study 1 were primarily descriptive, designed to map student experiences and institutional conditions rather than to test causal hypotheses. In Study 2, while the pre- and post-course design captured significant short-term shifts in students' confidence and ethical reasoning, the study relied on self-reported data and did not include a longitudinal follow-up to measure whether these behavioral and mindset changes persisted throughout the duration of their degree program.

Finally, given the rapid evolution of generative AI technologies and the corresponding flux in institutional policies, the data captured in Study 2 represents a snapshot of a highly volatile technological landscape. Students' specific anxieties and AI use cases may shift as both the tools and the institutional norms surrounding them mature. Future research utilizing longitudinal designs, diverse institutional contexts and degree levels, and cross-cultural comparisons will be necessary to determine the long-term efficacy of hospitality-infused integrity practices.

Conclusion and recommendations

Summary of contributions

This article examines how one Canadian graduate leadership program shifted from control-based responses to a more intentional, curious, collectively vigilant and compassionate approach by integrating academic hospitality and academic-integrity education for international students (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025). Study 1 showed that international graduate students navigate intense VUCA pressures and rely heavily on faculty behaviors and support services to experience the institution as hospitable (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025). Study 2 demonstrated that a short, intentionally designed scholarly inquiry course can produce substantial gains in integrity-related confidence and knowledge, and can reframe integrity as part of students' leadership identity, particularly when AI literacy is addressed explicitly.

Together, these studies highlight that belonging, ethical formation, and institutional resilience are co-produced through systems of hospitality and integrity, and that these systems can be intentionally aligned with SDG goals for quality education, reduced inequalities, and strong institutions (UN, 2015). Ultimately, this research suggests that higher education institutions navigating global complexity must look beyond policy enforcement, recognizing that compassion and structural clarity are critical prerequisites for academic rigor.

Recommendations for institutional leaders

For senior leaders (presidents, provosts, deans, program heads):

- (1) Adopt a systems-thinking lens for international student support. Treat academic policies, curriculum design, student services, and well-being resources as parts of a single system that shapes international students' experiences of trust and fairness (Cameron & Green, 2019; Dignan, 2019). Map how these elements interact and identify points where complexity is inadvertently intensified rather than eased (Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025).
- (2) Center VUCA Prime in strategic planning. Articulate a clear vision of international education that emphasizes holistic formation and ethical leadership; invest in data and dialogue that deepen understanding of international students' prior educational norms and non-academic pressures; ensure clarity by aligning integrity, AI, and assessment policies across programs and communicating them in accessible language; and cultivate agility by regularly reviewing and updating policies and supports in response to technological and geopolitical change (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022; Freeman-Gray, n.d.).
- (3) Institutionalize academic hospitality. Move hospitality from rhetoric to structure by resourcing cultural-adjustment services, mentorship programs, chaplaincy and counseling, and spaces for community building as core institutional functions rather than peripheral enhancements (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025). Monitor student feedback on hospitality as a key indicator of institutional health (Glass & Westmont, 2014).
- (4) Develop coherent AI and integrity governance. Establish cross-functional teams (including faculty, students, IT, and student services) to create concise, consistent guidelines for AI use and integrity expectations at the institutional level (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022; Lund *et al.*, 2025). Ensure these guidelines are integrated into program handbooks, course syllabi, and orientation materials, and revisit them as digital technologies evolve.
- (5) Preserve human capabilities in AI-mediated education. Treat AI and integrity governance as strategic leadership work, not back-office compliance, by integrating policy, assessment, student support, and institutional risk into coordinated decisions that strengthen trust and resilience amid ongoing change. Leaders should ensure that educational innovation preserves the human capabilities most needed in AI-mediated environments: critical inquiry, adaptability, sound judgment, and responsible decision-making.

Recommendations for faculty and program designers

For instructors, program coordinators, and curriculum committees:

- (1) Embed integrity and AI ethics in core courses.
- (2) Integrate integrity and AI literacy into graduate research or writing courses early in students' programs, using discipline-specific examples, knowledge-check vignettes,

and scaffolded assignments that provide repeated practice with citation, paraphrasing, and AI decision-making ([Sanni-Anibire et al., 2021](#)).

- (3) Teach explicitly from the students' starting points. Assume that many international students are encountering Western integrity norms, APA style, and AI expectations for the first time. Make tacit rules explicit, explain the "why" behind policies, and provide low-stakes opportunities to make and correct mistakes without severe penalties ([Openo, 2019](#); [Ploner, 2018](#)). Approach these conversations with curiosity rather than suspicion, using students' prior educational experiences as starting points for clarification, dialogue, and ethical formation.
- (4) Frame AI as a bounded learning partner. Discuss AI tools directly in class: clarify acceptable and unacceptable uses, provide examples of how to acknowledge AI where permitted, and explain how detection tools will and will not be used ([Lund et al., 2025](#)). Design staged assignments with required checkpoints, such as proposals, annotated outlines, drafts, reflective memos, revision narratives, or short process explanations, so that students' intellectual development and decision-making are visible across time ([Ennoure, 2026](#)). Shift assessment from simply evaluating what students produce to examining how they reason, revise, justify, and apply judgment through scenario-based, reflective, and iterative problem-solving tasks.
- (5) Encourage brainstorming and language-support uses while discouraging full-text generation and source fabrication ([Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022](#)). To address the risks of cognitive offloading and contextual insensitivity in AI outputs, explicitly teach students how to use AI to scaffold their thinking by evaluating accuracy, identifying bias, and testing assumptions rather than outsourcing their critical analysis ([Brown & Rossouw, 2026](#)).
- (6) Cultivate classroom-level hospitality. Attend intentionally to non-verbal friendliness, greetings, approachability, and opportunities for relational connection, recognizing that these behaviors are not incidental but central to students' sense of safety and belonging ([Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025](#); [Bennett, 2000](#)). Invite conversations about students' prior educational experiences and how they interpret academic norms ([Ploner, 2018](#); [Torres-Arends, 2023](#)).
- (7) Collaborate with support units. Partner with writing centers, librarians, and international student services to embed workshops on paraphrasing, APA, database use, and AI ethics within courses ([Mendis & Currie, 2020](#)). Share data about persistent student challenges to inform co-developed resources ([Anaya & Cepero Espinosa, 2025](#)).

Directions for future research

Future studies could extend this work by examining how similar hospitality-integrity integration function in other disciplines, institutions, and national contexts, and by exploring longitudinal outcomes such as graduation rates, leadership trajectories, and sustained AI practices among international graduates. Future research should also examine persistent challenges related to resource constraints, digital inclusivity, and uneven technological access, particularly within Global South higher education contexts where AI integration, policy frameworks, and institutional support structures may differ significantly ([Samuels & Singh, 2025](#)).

There is also scope for participatory research that positions international students as co-designers of policies and curricula, further embodying the ethic of hospitality and shared responsibility for institutional integrity ([Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000](#); [Phipps & Barnett, 2007](#)). Crucially, subsequent research should continue to examine these dynamics through a

critical internationalization lens, assessing how Western integrity frameworks might evolve to become more hospitable toward diverse cultural knowledge traditions and non-Western higher education environments.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used generative AI tools solely to copy-edit and refine the language of their own original, pre-existing text. No part of the manuscript was generated, drafted, or written by AI. The authors also used Perplexity, in response to author-developed prompts, to identify additional potentially relevant sources to complement those already gathered through the authors' own search process. All sources identified in this way were independently verified, evaluated, and, where appropriate, incorporated by the authors. The authors reviewed and edited the manuscript in full after using these tools and accept full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the manuscript, including its sources, interpretations, and conclusions.

References

- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290–305. doi: [10.1177/1028315307303542](https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542).
- Anaya, E. R., & Cepero Espinosa, S. (2025). Re-designing educational processes for relevance in a globalized VUCA context. In U. G. Singh, C. G. Proches, A. A. James, & R. Rutenbergs-Rozen (Eds.), *Higher educational leadership in VUCA contexts: Accessing VUCA Prime and wisdom for effective leadership* (pp. 197–215). Emerald.
- Beck, K., & Ilieva, R. (2019). 'Doing' internationalization: Principles to practice. *SFU Educational Review*, 12(3), 18–39. doi: [10.21810/sfuer.v12i3.1031](https://doi.org/10.21810/sfuer.v12i3.1031).
- Bennett, J. B. (2000). The academy and hospitality. *CrossCurrents*, 50(1-2), 23–35. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24461227>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. doi: [10.1191/1478088706qp0630a](https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a).
- Brosseau, L., & Dewing, M. (2018). Canadian multiculturalism. (Background paper Publication No. 2009-20-E). Library of Parliament. Available from: https://lop.parl.ca/sites/PublicWebsite/default/en_CA/ResearchPublications/200920E
- Brown, A., & Rossouw, J. (2026). Artificial intelligence as a reflexive collaborator in graduate studies supervision. *Transformation in Higher Education*, 11, a657. doi: [10.4102/the.v11i0.657](https://doi.org/10.4102/the.v11i0.657).
- Buckner, E., Clerk, S., Marroquin, A., & Zhang, Y. (2020). Strategic benefits, symbolic commitments: How Canadian colleges and universities frame internationalization. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 50(4), 20–36. doi: [10.47678/cjhe.vi0.188827](https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.vi0.188827).
- Cameron, E., & Green, M. (2019). *Making sense of change management: A complete guide to the models, tools, and techniques of organizational change* (5th ed.). London: Kogan Page.
- Canadian Multiculturalism Act (R.S.C., 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.)). Available from: <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-18.7/page-1.html>
- Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C., & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: Transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 3(3), 171–193. doi: [10.1207/s15327701jlie0303_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0303_1).
- Christensen Hughes, J. (2024). The essentiality of academic integrity in an increasingly disrupted and polarized world. In M. E. Norris, & S. M. Smith (Eds.), *Leading the way: Envisioning the future of higher education*. eCampus Ontario.
- Couture, Z. J. (2025). Unearthing the 'established citizen': International students' inaccess to justice from housing to study permits. *Alberta Law Review*, 62(3), 755–780. doi: [10.29173/alr2824](https://doi.org/10.29173/alr2824).
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. doi: [10.1177/1094428108318066](https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428108318066).

- Dawson, P., & Andriopoulos, C. (2021). *Managing change, creativity and innovation* (4th ed.). London: SAGE.
- Dai, Y., Lai, S., Lim, C. P., & Liu, A. (2023). ChatGPT and its impact on research supervision: Insights from Australian postgraduate research students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(4), 74–88. doi: [10.14742/ajet.8843](https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.8843).
- Dawson, S., Eshleman, K., & Siemens, G. (2018). Complexity: A leader's framework for understanding and managing change in higher education. *Educause Review*, 53(6). Available from: <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2018/10/complexity-a-leaders-framework-for-understanding-and-managing-change-in-higher-education>
- Derrida, J., & Dufourmantelle, A. (2000). *Of hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle invites Jacques Derrida to respond* (R. Bowlby, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Dignan, A. (2019). Changing organizational mindset. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 17(2). doi: [10.48558/hkrn-1n18](https://doi.org/10.48558/hkrn-1n18).
- Dodge, R., Daly, A. P., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. D. (2012). The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 2(3), 222–235. doi: [10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4](https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4).
- Eaton, S. E., & Christensen Hughes, J. (2022). Academic integrity in Canada: Historical perspectives and current trends. In Eaton, S. E., & Christensen Hughes, J. (Eds.), *Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge* (pp. 3–24). Springer International. doi: [10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-1_1).
- Ennoure, T. (2026). *From restriction to integration: Practical strategies for embracing AI in online courses*. Faculty Focus. Available from: <https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/online-education/from-restriction-to-integration-practical-strategies-for-embracing-ai-in-online-courses/>
- Environics Institute for Survey Research (2024). *Canadian public opinion about immigration and refugees*. Available from: <https://www.environicsinstitute.org/projects/project-details/canadian-public-opinion-about-immigration-and-refugees—fall-2024>
- Freeman-Gray, J. (n.d.). VUCA Prime. Mutomorro: Change for good. Available from: <https://mutomorro.com/vuca-prime>
- Gibson, S., & Eamer, A. (2025). Academic integrity policy and support provisions: Are Ontario colleges setting international students up for success?. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, 8(2), 1–17. doi: [10.55016/ojs/cpai.v8i2.80233](https://doi.org/10.55016/ojs/cpai.v8i2.80233).
- Glass, C. R., & Westmont, C. M. (2014). Comparative effects of belongingness on the academic success and cross-cultural interactions of domestic and international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 38, 106–119. doi: [10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.04.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.04.004).
- Goldstein, B. E. (2021). Weaving social innovation communities during times of disruption. *Social Innovations Journal*, 5. Available from: <https://socialinnovationsjournal.com/index.php/sij/article/view/706>
- Government of Canada (2025). Supplementary information for the 2026–2028 Immigration Levels Plan. Available from: <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugeescitizenship/corporate/mandate/corporate-initiatives/levels/supplementary-immigration-levels-2026-2028.html>
- Hamakawa, M., & Yamamoto, T. (2023). The innovator's tale of the phoenix and dragon. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. doi: [10.48558/fnwv-3443](https://doi.org/10.48558/fnwv-3443).
- Harden-Wolfson, E., Hutcheson, S., & Zhang, Y. (2025). Representing the problem of (un) ethical practices in Canada's post-pandemic international student policy landscape. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 55(2), 114–131. doi: [10.47678/cjhe.v55i2.190701](https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v55i2.190701).
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.) (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Howe, E. R., Ramirez, G., & Walton, P. (2023). Experiences of international students at a Canadian university: Barriers and supports. *Journal of Comparative and International Higher Education*, 15(2), 115–133. doi: [10.32674/jcihe.v15i2.4819](https://doi.org/10.32674/jcihe.v15i2.4819).

- Hoxhaj, M., Muharremi, O., & Arif, A. M. (2025). International students in Canadian higher education: Ethical challenges in employment and financial stability in the Greater Toronto Area. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 9(2), 83–93. doi: 10.61093/bel.9(2).83-93.2025.
- ICEF Monitor (2024). *Canada hosted more than 1 million international students in 2023*. Available from: <https://monitor.icef.com/2024/01/canada-hosted-more-than-1-million-international-students-in-2023/>
- Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (2024a, January 22). *Canada to stabilize growth and decrease number of new international student permits issued to approximately 360,000 for 2024*. Available from: <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/news/2024/01/canada-to-stabilize-growth-and-decrease-number-of-new-international-student-permits-issued-to-approximately-360000-for-2024.html>
- Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (2024b, November 15). Work off campus as an international student. Available from: <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/study-canada/work/work-off-campus.html>
- Imperiale, M. G., Phipps, A., & Fassetta, G. (2021). On online practices of hospitality in higher education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 40(6), 629–648. doi: 10.1007/s11217-021-09770-z.
- Introna, L. D., & Hayes, N. (2011). On sociomaterial imbrications: What plagiarism detection systems reveal and why it matters. *Information and Organization*, 21(2), 107–122. doi: 10.1016/j.infoandorg.2011.03.001.
- Institute of International Education (2023). A quick look at global mobility trends. Available from: https://www.iie.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Project-Atlas_Infographic_2023_2.pdf
- Kang, J. -J., & Metcalfe, A. S. (2019). Living and learning between Canada and Korea: The academic experiences and cultural challenges of undergraduate international exchange students. *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*, 11(2), 28–36. doi: 10.32674/jcihe.v11iFall.1074.
- Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2013). Embracing emergence: How collective impact addresses complexity. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 11(1), 1–7. Available from: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/social_progress_through_collective_impact
- Kofinas, A. K., Tsay, C. H. -H., & Pike, D. (2025). The impact of generative AI on academic integrity of authentic assessments within a higher education context. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56(6), 2522–2549. doi: 10.1111/bjet.13585.
- Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J. (2023). GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. *Patterns*, 4(7), 100779. doi: 10.1016/j.patter.2023.100779.
- Lodge, J. M., Thompson, K., & Corrin, L. (2023). Mapping out a research agenda for generative artificial intelligence in tertiary education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(1), 1–8. doi: 10.14742/ajet.8695.
- Lund, B. D., Lee, T. H., Mannuru, N. R., & Arutla, N. (2025). AI and academic integrity: Exploring student perceptions and implications for higher education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 23(3), 1545–1565. doi: 10.1007/s10805-025-09613-3.
- Macfarlane, B. (2017). The moral panic over student cheating must end. *Times Higher Education*. Available from: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/opinion/moral-panic-over-student-cheating-must-end>
- Majee, U. S., & Ress, S. B. (2020). Colonial legacies in internationalisation of higher education: Racial justice and geopolitical redress in South Africa and Brazil. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 50(4), 463–481. doi: 10.1080/03057925.2018.1521264.
- McKenna, S. (2025). Foregrounding doctoral knowledge and knower in the age of Generative Artificial Intelligence. *Transformation in Higher Education*, 10, a653. doi: 10.4102/the.v10i0.653.
- Meadows, D. H. (2008). *Thinking in systems: A primer*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

- Mendis, D., & Currie, J. (2020). International student support services: An exploration of their role and effectiveness. *Journal of International Students*, 10(3), 773–789.
- Nanos Research (2023). *Canadians prefer that Canada accepts fewer immigrants and international students than what is projected for 2023*. Available from: <https://nanos.co/canadians-prefer-that-canada-accepts-fewer-immigrants-and-international-students-than-what-is-projected-for-2023-globe-nanos>
- Niagara University Library (2026). *Considerations with international students: Plagiarism guide for faculty*. Niagara University. Available from: <https://library.niagara.edu/plagiarismfaculty/intlstudent>
- Nilsson, W., & Paddock, T. (2013). Inscaping: Exploring the connection between experiential surfacing and social innovation [Paper presentation]. *Social Frontiers: The next edge of social innovation research*. Available from: <http://www.transitsocialinnovation.eu/content/original/Book%20covers/Local%20PDFs/114%20Paper%20Nilsson%20and%20Paddock%20Inscaping%20exploring%20the%20connection%20between%20experiential%20surfacing%20and%20SI%202013.pdf>
- Nilsson, W., & Paddock, T. (2014). Social innovation from the inside out. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 12(1), 46–52. doi: [10.48558/TH2Y-1N81](https://doi.org/10.48558/TH2Y-1N81).
- Oldham, C. (2025). Artificial intelligence and assessment: Are universities ready to rethink integrity? *International Center for Academic Integrity*. Available from: https://academicintegrity.org/aws/ICAI/pt/sd/news_article/603119/_PARENT/layout_details/false
- Openo, J. (2019). The international dimension of academic integrity: An integrative literature review. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, 2(2), 22–37. doi: [10.55016/ojs/cpai.v2i2.68091](https://doi.org/10.55016/ojs/cpai.v2i2.68091).
- Openo, J. A., & Robinson, R. (2021). The emotional labour of academic integrity: How does it feel?. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, 4(1), 20–39. doi: [10.55016/ojs/cpai.v4i1.71350](https://doi.org/10.55016/ojs/cpai.v4i1.71350).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2025). *Education at a glance 2025: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. doi: [10.1787/1c0d9c79-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/1c0d9c79-en).
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 201–230. doi:[10.2307/3588141](https://doi.org/10.2307/3588141).
- Phipps, A., & Barnett, R. (2007). Academic hospitality. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 6(3), 237–254. doi: [10.1177/1474022207080829](https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022207080829).
- Plano Clark, V. L., & Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Understanding research: A consumer's guide* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Plano Clark, V. L., & Ivankova, N. V. (2016). *Mixed methods research: A guide to the field*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Ploner, J. (2018). International students' transitions to UK higher education – revisiting the concept and practice of academic hospitality. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 17(2), 164–178. doi: [10.1177/1475240918786690](https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240918786690).
- Rhoads, D. M. (2013). Hospitality in the classroom. *Currents in Theology and Mission*, 40(4), 255–261.
- Risko, E. F., & Gilbert, S. J. (2016). Cognitive offloading. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(9), 676–688. doi: [10.1016/j.tics.2016.07.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.07.002).
- Samuels, A. B., & Singh, U. (2025). Education reimagined: South Africa's journey through the 4IR and beyond. *Transformation in Higher Education*, 10, a482. doi: [10.4102/the.v10i0.482](https://doi.org/10.4102/the.v10i0.482).
- Sanni-Anibire, H., Stoesz, B. M., Gervais, L., & Vogt, L. (2021). International students' knowledge and emotions related to academic integrity at Canadian postsecondary institutions. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 19(4), 585–606. doi: [10.1007/s10805-021-09420-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09420-1).
- Scollon, R. (1995). Plagiarism and ideology: Identity in intercultural discourse. *Language in Society*, 24(1), 1–28. doi: [10.1017/S0047404500018388](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500018388).
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday/Currency.

-
- Stein, S. (2021). Critical internationalization studies at an impasse: Making space for complexity, uncertainty, and complicity in a time of global challenges. *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(9), 1771–1784. doi: [10.1080/03075079.2019.1704722](https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1704722).
- Torres-Arends, I. (2023). ‘I thought we were friends’: International students’ challenges in navigating basic academic regulations at a Canadian university. *Journal of Comparative and International Higher Education*, 15(1), 93–110. Available from: <https://digitalcommons.lib.uconn.edu/jcihe/vol15/iss1/10>
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(4), 298–318. doi: [10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002).
- United Nations (n.d.a). *Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Available from: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4>
- United Nations (n.d.b). *Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Available from: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal10>
- United Nations (n.d.c). *Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Available from: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal16>
- United Nations (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. Available from: <https://sdgs.un.org/sites/default/files/publications/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf>

Corresponding author

Ella Ruth Anaya can be contacted at: rutha@twu.ca