The concept of security and its relevance to the international education market

Helen Forbes-Mewett[1]
1 Monash University, PO Box 11, Clayton, Victoria, 3800
Web Address: http://www.monash.edu.au
 Email Address: Helen.Forbes-Mewett@buseco.monash.edu.au

Abstract

Though the social and economic security of international students is an important factor influencing student and parent decisions regarding where to access international education, researchers have paid little attention to defining the notion of 'security'. Drawing on literature from a range of fields, the current paper is used to advance the concept of security as a broadly applicable term and to relate the concept to cultural difference and relocation. These issues are contextualised within the rising international educational market and how pastoral care is managed in Australia and New Zealand.

Key Words

International students, education, security, pastoral care.

Introduction

Personal security is an important factor influencing international students and their parents when deciding on a host country and institution. Despite increased use of the term, the concept of 'security' is rarely addressed directly in relevant literature. Further, education market researchers are well versed in the sources of security, but little advanced in defining the concept. The need for conceptual understanding as a presupposition to the identification of the conditions required to attain a state of security requires the question: how can security needs and sources of security be examined if the meaning of what constitutes security is not understood? The current paper presents a cross-disciplinary analysis that formulates the main perspectives relating to the concept of security. In doing so, security is defined in the most general application and then the notion is examined along a number of the dimensions extant within what is broadly termed the 'security literature'. Perspectives from international relations/security studies, economics, psychology and sociology provide a broad picture of the issues that come into play and it is argued that by separating the objective from the subjective dimensions, security can both be defined as an abstract concept and identified as a basic need and right.

Cultural influences and relocation add to the complexity of security within the international education market. The relevance of security to this market derives from student needs emanating from their status as consumers of education, workers, and human beings. Universities have become financially dependent on the income derived from international students but this dependency is founded on shaky ground for though Australia has had 'reasonable growth' in international student commencement - May 2005 figures show an increase of 3.5% compared with the same period last year - this rate may not sustain current enrolment levels (AIE International Student Enrolment Data, May 2005). While the reasons for the decline are unclear, a real or perceived lack of security may be a contributing factor. Regardless, security provision for international students should be paramount irrespective of market trends and, given the importance placed on security by students and parents when choosing education, it is important security be part of the delivered product.

Defining security

Though scholars have advanced varied notions of what security involves, most skirt the need to define the term by discussing the sources of security, and indeed insecurity. This section demonstrates 'security' can be defined in an abstract sense. Baldwin (1997:8) rightly contends that:

> Understanding the concept of security is a fundamentally different kind of intellectual exercise from specifying the conditions under which security may be attained. Indeed, conceptual clarification logically precedes the search for the necessary conditions of security, because the identification of such conditions presupposes a concept of security.

Baldwin's work is set apart from much of the literature because he explains how and why we should define security. He builds on the work of Wolfers (1952:484) whose classic essay suggested '[s]ecurity points to some degree of protection of values previously acquired'. Baldwin seizes this notion to set the concept in a

broad and more contemporary sense that embraces a commonality that allows us to use the concept in any circumstance. In discussing the importance of conceptual analysis, Baldwin (1997:6) asserts:

> Conceptual analysis is not concerned with testing hypotheses or constructing theories, though it is relevant to both. It is concerned with clarifying the meaning of concepts. Some would dismiss such undertakings as 'mere semantics' or 'pure logomachy'. Without clear concepts, however, scholars are apt to talk past each other, and policy-makers find it difficult to distinguish between alternative policies.

Baldwin's analysis of security fits the criteria for explicating a concept. It is broadly applicable; relatable by definition to other terms; encourages empirical investigation; and is termed using the standard language and application used by most people in varying situations (Oppenheim, 1975). Recognising the difficulty of expecting a total absence of threat Baldwin (1997:13) defines security as '*a low probability of damage to acquired values*'. This understanding places emphasis on the preservation of acquired values, and offers a definition of 'security in its most general sense [that] can be defined in terms of two specifications: Security for whom? And security for which values?' (Baldwin, 1997:13). When considering security for whom and for which values, it becomes apparent that the concept of security, objective in its abstract state, is subjective in its application. The distinction between the objective and subjective dimensions becomes clearer when we ask 'Security for whom?' The answer can be as diverse as 'some, most or all' individuals, states, or international systems, depending on the research question under consideration (Baldwin, 1997:13). This diversity is further extended by the necessity of specifying the values for which security is sought. There is the possibility of over or underestimating the likelihood of damage to acquired values, a process thought to be related to the objectiveness and subjectiveness of security (Wolfers, 1952). While Wolfers makes the important distinction between the objective and subjective dimensions of security, it is the failure of others to make this distinction that has led to confusion as to what constitutes security as an abstract concept.

Other specifications outlined by Baldwin (1997:14-17) concern subjective dimensions – for example: 'How much security? … From what threats? … By what means? … At what cost? … [and] In what time period?' How much security tends to be viewed from two different perspectives. From one view, security is a matter of degree, suggesting one can have greater or lesser security depending on circumstances (Wolfers, 1952). The other perspective refutes the notion of varying degrees of security taking an all or nothing approach that holds one either has security or one does not (Brodie, 1950). Security, however, is commonly referred to by degree and this usage embraced in this paper is a notion supported by Baldwin (1997:17) who suggests that specification requires 'at least some indication of how much security is being sought for which values of which actors with respect to which threats'. In summation, Baldwin's characterisation of security as '*a low probability of damage to acquired values*' is a definition that is acceptable to all situations and to support this claim discussion now moves from the abstract to consider security from four perspectives.

International relations/security studies - International relations/security studies makes no excuses for not defining the concept of security insistent the term must be kept within specific boundaries that relate directly to the threat, use, and control of military force (Nye and Lynn-Jones, 1988). Security studies specialists argue that to broaden understanding of the term to encompass the security of groups and individuals would be detrimental to the discipline as it would 'destroy its intellectual coherence and make it more difficult to devise solutions' to international conflict (Walt, 1991). The danger of war and the likelihood of suppressed debate on national security leading to misguided policies has been justification for the 'ivory tower' nature of security studies within academia. Despite the limitations of 'security studies' it remains a field of direct relevance to the international education market. First, it is relevant because current international concerns relating to terrorism inevitably impacts upon specific groups and individuals deemed to present a threat and this includes international students. Second, it is relevant because it is 'the traditional concern with security from external military threats' that provides the background for defining of security in an abstract sense (Baldwin, 1997:5). Baldwin is not alone in his use of a national security perspective to develop the concept of security. The national security perspective, in particular the work of Baldwin, is well utilised by Nesadurai (2005) in her endeavour to define 'economic security'.

Economics - The economic perspective relates security to markets and trade. Economic security is high on the agenda of many states, however, like the truncated term 'security', there appears to be an assumption that what the concept means is known to all. Nesadurai (2005:4) addresses this assumption by scrutinizing the term 'economic security' in a global era that is both prosperous and fraught with apparent uncertainty. She argues that 'any conception of economic security needs to pay close attention to the economic insecurities generated by global capitalism' and needs to acknowledge historical, political and social influences on states and societies (Nesadurai 2005:3). Scholars with critical approaches have had little difficulty in adopting the

notion of 'economic insecurity' as a result of economic misfortune and applying it to all levels from state to individual (Scholte, 2000). Others, such as those concerned with public policy, have focussed on the economic and social well-being of individuals and societies rather than state and military preoccupations. Thus, Nesadurai (2005:2) extends Baldwin's definition by adding economic qualifiers in an attempt to demonstrate that 'economic security' is a different form of security that relates to economic values exclusively. She offers a definition stating that economic security is a 'low probability of damage to a set of three key economic values: (a) streams of income and consumption necessary for minimal human/family needs; (b) market integrity; and (c) distributive equity'.

This definition identifies economic sources of security, thus nullifying this definition as abstract concept. However, the notion of economic security allows emphasis on both the security of national power and a broader conception that addresses the economic needs of the individual based on historical, political and social considerations. This duality introduces 'human security', a notion taken up by many (United Nations Development Programme, 1994; King and Murray, 2001/2002; Alkire, 2003; Commission on Human Security, 2003). Alkire (2002:34) canvasses the main competing definitions and characterisations of human security and concludes that a 'concept of human security would do well to give a coherent account of the elements it contains, how these might be amended and how potential security claims will be identified and pursued in practice'. Herein lies the problem with conceptualisation – once practical applications enter the equation, the concept is no longer pure in theory, no longer an abstract. The Commission on Human Security (2003:4) addresses the variability of human security by suggesting that security should 'protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment'. The notion of 'vital core' is defined as 'a set of elementary rights and freedoms people enjoy' (Commission on Human Security, 2003:4). The Commission lists a number of strategies relating to economic and financial crisis in developing countries that put human security at risk:

- Putting systems in place to ensure basic economic security before catastrophic crises hit.
- Expanding existing programmes if the crisis has already hit. Scaling up existing programmes is one of the most cost-effective and time-effective ways of responding to a financial crisis or emergency.
- Setting up regular in-depth information-gathering mechanisms (Commission on Human Security, 2003:85).

Further, it is suggested that policy and program measures should 'emerge from social dialogue with all actors, not just government, the private sector and workers organizations' (Commission on Human Security, 2003:86). In many cases these groups do not represent those most in need. The assertion that the poor should contribute to policy relating to the needs of the poor can be translated into the circumstances of international students. Essentially, this suggests international students should contribute to policy relating to their needs.

The broad-based notion of human security is embraced by ILO Director General, Juan Somavia (1999), who asserts the most efficient and economic measure of security is to provide humans with their basic needs, to be concerned for others well-being rather than deal with the manifestations of the pervasiveness of lack of security. Fitting with this view, the many dimensions of security, particularly in relation to human needs, continue to unfold when examined from the psychological and sociological disciplinary perspectives.

Psychology - The psychological perspective is primarily concerned with trying to understand the minds and behaviours of organisms and because its boundaries are few it has difficulty explaining the concept of security. Nevertheless, the work of Maslow (1943) provides an ideal starting point to present this perspective. Though scholars from various disciplines have argued security is a basic human need (Maslow, 1943; Straub, 2003; Doyal and Gough, 1991), it was Maslow who ranked security under the guise of 'safety' as a psychological need second only to the most basic physiological needs, such as oxygen, food and water. Needs are those things that are required as opposed to desires, which are unsatisfied longings or cravings. The difference is clarified when we consider needs as rights and desires as requests. Maslow's *Hierarchy of Needs* indicates that when all fundamental physiological needs are satisfied, the psychological need for safety or security comes into play. Commonly, safety refers to physical safety, however, the *need* to feel safe or secure is primarily psychological (Norwood, 2005) and it is this dimension that explains why Maslow insists safety or security needs follow rather than precede the fulfilment of physiological needs. After one's safety is attained, belongingness, love, esteem and actualisation needs dominate respectively. In the words of Maslow (1943:154), 'the appearance of one need usually rests on the prior satisfaction of another'. These needs ensure that the capacities of the human become 'primarily safety-seeking tools' (Maslow, 1943:158). Maslow's 'safety needs' are shown to encompass what others (Dennis, 1940; Doyal and Gough, 1991; Poku, Renwick and Glenn, 2000, for example) describe from a sociological perspective as 'security needs'.

Sociology – The sociological perspective is similar to that offered by psychology in the sense that it has few boundaries. However, the primary distinction between the two disciplines is that psychology is concerned with the minds and behaviours of organisms while sociology analyses the structure and agency of human society. Despite taking different approaches, the boundaries are blurred between the subject matter explored. Within the sociological framework, the concept of security is viewed as either a goal, a need or as 'a by-product of certain experiences' (Cameron and McCormick, 1954:556). It is held that security is intrinsically entwined with insecurity, however, application and definition of these concepts has not been consistent. The sociological perspective is broad and encompassing and as with the psychological view point tends to skirt the issue by focussing on its many and varied sources. Thomas and Adler initiated sociological analysis of the concept in 1917, with Adler (1917, 1926, 1930) focussing on insecurity and its tendency to be associated with feelings of inferiority, and Thomas (1917) viewing security as a basic need (Cameron and McCormick, 1954). Whilst the views of Adler and Thomas appear psychological in nature, they become sociological when applied to groups of people, or when social influences impact upon the individual. The view that security is a basic need is familiar to all sociologists and manifest in the work of many (Sadler, 1929; Gesell, 1942; Symonds, 1946; and Young, 1941, for example). The sociological nature of a need for security is demonstrated by William's (1925) undertaking that 'security can and should be given to the anxious …' (Cameron and McCormick, 1954:556). This means security is a reflection of social circumstances rather than an unchangeable personal trait. However, the interrelationship between the disciplines of sociology and psychology demonstrate security cannot be explored satisfactorily from one perspective alone. This is further demonstrated by the claim that individual insecurity is complicated by the existence of psychological insecurity arising from 'a personality characteristic, independent of present external conditions and largely determined by early, especially infantile, experiences' (Cameron and McCormick, 1954:558). Despite the distinction, the possibility of one compounding the other cannot be ignored. Indeed, it is generally believed that 'insecurity is a cause of aggressive attitudes and behaviour' (Sherman, 1941:176). In addition, it is widely held that the consequences of insecurity can be far reaching as they often lead to mental illness (Cameron and McCormick, 1954). Those with stable personalities are thought to have a background of emotional security (Biber, Murphy, Woodcock and Black, 1942; Freud, 1937; Healy, Bronner and Bowers, 1930). These psychoanalytic approaches help explain the difference between an internal feeling of security as a result of childhood experiences and the security sought in one's environment.

Having specified a number of disciplinary perspectives, in order to expand upon the abstract the discussion links the notion of security to other fundamental elements such as rights, culture and relocation. These adjectives intuitively link security with elements that are seen to be important to international students. In what follows the discussion proceeds to explore the status of security in relation to rights.

The right to security

Given humans *need* security this suggests access to security is a right. However, this is a problematic claim. It is not difficult to imagine the security provided by adequate nourishment and housing, are basic rights. On the other hand, if a sense of security is obtained only from a standard of living higher than normal, then this upsets the notion of security being a basic right and this variance needs to be accommodated by assuming humans have a right to have their needs satisfied to the 'optimum' extent (Doyal and Gough, 1991; Straub, 2003; and human rights literature generally). This application is fitting with Doyal and Gough's (1991:155) assertion that 'basic needs … are always universal but their satisfiers are often relative'. Milner, Poe and Leblang (1999:408) support this notion when they note security, subsistence and liberty are recognised as rights having been 'referenced in, and guaranteed under the provisions of the International Bill of Human Rights'. The International Bill of Human Rights consists of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), as well as two Optional Protocols. These documents provide statements concerning various levels of rights that are ultimately supportive of the notion that 'security', in the sense that it has been defined in this paper, is indeed a human right. The topics of 'subsistence rights', 'security rights' and 'liberties' allow Milner et al to guide us through sources of security that are guaranteed in the UDHR. First, research relating to subsistence rights considers cultural variance in the protection of subsistence rights. The UDHR (1948) indicates that everyone has a right to an adequate standard of living for themselves and their family – this includes, amongst other things, the basic needs of adequate food, clothing, and housing, as well as basic health care and social services. These rights are extended under the ICESCR (1966), which recognises the right to 'the continuous improvement of living conditions' as well as the right to the highest possible level of mental and physical health. Second, security

rights in Milner et al's article refer to those rights that are designed to physically protect people from violations, such as execution, torture or imprisonment, arising from arbitrary, political or religious vilification. Protection from such extreme violation must necessarily be considered in relation to the concept of 'security', however, so too must violations of lesser severity that are nonetheless still damaging to the person. In recent studies, the example of Muslim female students having their scarves pulled from their heads is an indication of a violation of rights that directly relates to culture and relocation (Deumert, Marginson, Nyland, Ramia and Sawir, 2005).

Culture, relocation and security

The influences of culture and relocation impact upon security - together they present a diverse range of circumstances that need to be considered. A combination of cultural elements together interact within any given society to shape understanding of what constitutes insecurity and who has responsibility for ensuring communities and individuals are secure. Both religious and secular influences, for example, can impact on the issues concerning security. All the major religions have an understanding of what these issues entail. Islam, for example, provides security through a system that strikes 'a balance that provides individual motivation, and emphasises co-operation and mutual responsibility, social justice, and the equitable distribution of wealth' (Bouma, Haidar, Nyland, and Smith, 2003:54-55). Christianity, on the other hand calls on the power of God and the goodwill and charity of people, especially those in positions of leadership to provide what is necessary for people's security. Various streams within religions ensure a diversity of perceptions of security that manifest in secular relations, such as the family for example. Gender, of course, often interacts with religions and other ideological dimensions.

Ideas relating to the provision of security draw on two main streams of thought. The key to success and subsequent security in a society where there is little redistribution of wealth is thought to rest with individual effort (Bénabou and Tirole, 2005). This view is believed to stimulate motivation and encourage individuals to take responsibility for their own security. The other view holds that the state should take responsibility for the security of those in need and welfare policy is developed accordingly. These contrasting views of self-reliance and redistribution demonstrate the different understandings of what security entails and what it means to be secure. Attitudes relating to who should be responsible for individual's security vary greatly between different countries and redistributive policies vary accordingly. Bénabou and Tirole use the contrasting example of the American tendency to hold citizens responsible for their own security, as opposed to a European perspective that is less likely to hold this view. This equates to the US spending significantly less than European countries on the security needs of citizens. According to Bénabou and Tirole, this variance suggests that attitudes shape policy or policy shapes attitudes, the former being the standard interpretation. It is possible, however, that both processes work together towards a compatible outcome. Regardless, this demonstrates the importance of attitudes relating to who is held responsible for people's security.

Societies that have been indoctrinated by capitalist values tend to believe that effort is the catalyst for bringing about security and that responsibility rests with the individual (Bénabou and Tirole, 2005). China presents a stark contrast. One hundred years of Marxism has shaped Chinese culture relative to who takes responsibility for people's security. Despite significant economic reform since 1979 that has brought about an improvement in living standards and increased opportunities, Chinese people maintain a strong belief in state intervention for the purposes of social protection (Wong and Lee, 2000). Wong and Lee (2000:114) found 'a strong reliance on the state … rather than on oneself or the family for meeting practical social needs such as housing, health care, and retirement'. Neglect of these security needs would reflect badly on the state and hinder social and economic progress. In drawing attention to the need for social protection for sustainable economic growth, Wong and Lee (2000:115) argue that 'social protection is an indispensable part of the institutional arrangement for any modern society'. A convergence of attitudes is evident between the Chinese surveyed in Wong and Lee's study and the findings of Coughlin (1980:160-161) who found that 'within welfare capitalism …. people cherish individual values such as achievement and success on the one hand, and accept state intervention on the other hand'. This parallels Bénabou and Tirole's (2005) finding that the association between effort and reward is overestimated and is of little help to the poor. The emerging picture is one that is generally supportive of state provision of social protection but questions remain unanswered concerning what form and extent government intervention should take.

An attitudinal survey conducted in China revealed a significant gap between the level of expectation of certain 'citizen' rights, and the practice of those rights (Wong and Wong, 2005). High expectations of work,

a guarantee of basic living standards and that the government should make good use of public money, were all left wanting with the provision of basic education being the only expectation fulfilled (Wong and Wong, 2005). Traditional Chinese culture does not see fit to expect government assistance in caring for children so the low-level of practice was not inappropriate. The study demonstrated greatest concern relating to how the government spent public money and that most citizens believed they did not enjoy social rights in accordance with their social responsibilities. Wong and Wong (2005) argue that assumptions of citizen entitlements are associated with Chinese culture and arguably most other cultures. They suggest that 'social rights will in the future continue to operate as powerful abstract universal categories that offer people grounds upon which they will advance their claims against the agents of the state', however this does not eliminate the importance of local, contextual influences (Wong and Wong, 2005:31). Whilst Wong and Wong suggest that the gap between expectations and the provision of social security measures may be universal, it is clear that different cultures have a different understanding of what security entails and of what it means to be secure. Security needs are directly related to cultural influences and the significance of both come to the surface when individuals relocate to a foreign environment. People relocating from different cultures, including international students, are confronted with a new set of complex cultural issues that impact upon their security. Likewise, the host country is also confronted with a new set of complex cultural issues that appear to be threatening. Consequently, relocation compounds the need for security and illuminates the necessity for a closer look at the implications for those who are relocating as well as the implications for the host country, or in the case of international students, the host institution.

The shift of focus in the literature from state-based security to human needs security does not mean inter-nation issues no longer pose a threat to individual security. This becomes apparent when considering the link between security and migration or short-term population movements. Specifically, relocation often involves the presentation of new values and threats to old values (Graham, 2000). When people relocate, they bring with them their predetermined culture and, regrettably, outsiders who do not fit the mould of common citizenship are sometimes seen as a threat to people's security and subsequently excluded from the mainstream. Under such circumstances, the threat to security is two-way, as those being excluded also experience a loss of security. Similarly, inter-nation relocation can cause the people of the 'host' country to feel economically and socially threatened as the incoming group may be viewed as drawing upon benefits provided by a state to which they are not contributing (Graham, 2000). Such views lead '[m]embers of a diaspora [to] believe they are not – and perhaps never will be – fully accepted in their host societies and so remain partly separate or ghettoised' (Graham, 2000:195). The incoming group's commitment to their home country is thought to impact upon security in the host country (Graham, 2000), however, if we utilise Baldwin's concept of security as defined earlier in this paper as *a low probability of damage to acquired values*, it becomes evident that the security of the host country is unlikely to be damaged. It is more likely that the acquired values of the host country will be enhanced due to the introduction of new cultural dimensions. The benefits of the movement of people across international borders are well-documented. The Commission on Human Security (2003:41) reports: 'The movement of people across borders reinforces the interdependence of countries and communities and enhances diversity. It facilitates the transfer of skills and knowledge. It stimulates economic growth and development. And for the majority of people, whether they are migrating temporarily or permanently, it creates new opportunities for pleasure or business'.

For most people, migration is a means of improving lives and for many it is 'vital to protect and attain human security' (Commission on Human Security, 2003:41). However, it seems that security can not be assumed for all incoming groups. Regrettably, the international agencies do not address the issue of student security, for instance, 'the International Labour Agency (ILO) … specifically excludes students from its definition of 'migrants'' (Deumert et al., 2005). According to Graham (2000:196), 'the problem for the security of some sections of diasporas is that of rejection by the host because of racism, ethnic tension, economic jealousy, cultural friction or political instability'. Cultural security relates to being 'one of us' and differences relating to 'physical appearance, language, religion, [and] cultural practices' can often create mistrust (Graham, 2000:197). This juxtaposed with the fact that those who relocate often have fewer rights in a new locale in addition to the loss of rights enjoyed at home, means the incoming group may be seriously disadvantaged. Despite Australia's population being largely Anglo-Celtic in origin, fears relating to other cultures remain a political reality. The emergence on Australia's political scene of the One Nation Party that attracted support from those who fear others from different cultures is testament to this. Such attitudes appear to ignore the fact that '[c]ountries spend large sums [of money] encouraging people to visit for … study or work which the host population is unable or willing to do' (Graham, 2000:210).

The earlier suggestion that the right to security is relative to cultural expectations becomes complicated in circumstances that encompass more than one culture, thus raising the question: which cultural expectations apply? In the case of migrants or those who are temporarily relocated in a host country as are international students, is it the cultural expectations of a person's originating country that apply when considering security or is it the cultural expectations of the host country? Perhaps it is both. Regardless, Rothschild's (1995:71) assertion that 'to have a right means very little … if one is not conscious of the right' becomes particularly pertinent when considering the notions of security and relocation. The female Muslim students in the previously mentioned example may not have been aware that it is their right to be free from violation and, furthermore, the perpetrators demonstrate a lack of understanding of the practices and rights of others who have relocated from different cultures. This is but one example that highlights the urgency of the need to address the issue of security in reference to the international education market.

The international education market and security

The issues raised in this paper are contextualised within the rising international educational market. This section gives an overview of how student security is managed in Australia and New Zealand. It is through this mechanism that the interface of the international education market and student security is identified.

Government funding cuts saw Australian universities turn successfully to the international education market for survival. This survival, however, is dependent on a continued influx of international students. The volatility of the market has seen universities adopt the characteristics of corporate behaviour in order to compete (Marginson and Considine, 2000). Marginson and Considine (2004:4) assert: 'Some elements of this 'market', particularly the education of international students, are driven by a frankly commercial and entrepreneurial spirit, now a key (though by no means always dominant) element of the enterprise culture'.

The growth of the enrolment and commencement of students on student visas studying in Australia has slowed (AIE data, 2005) sparking media attention and concern by universities regarding the continuation of this source of income. With fears that enrolment growth may further decline, universities are faced with the challenge continuing to attract international students. The factors considered by students and parents in their decision making relating to international education are, therefore, of increasing importance to universities. The identification of a safe environment being an important factor (Mazzarol et al., 2001; 2002) means that universities are now compelled to address the issue of security in relation to international students.

Recognising the benefits of international education and the expectation to provide quality service to international students, Australian Governments require education providers to register on the Commonwealth Register of Institutions and Courses for Overseas Students (CRICOS) under the National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students (The National Code). The National Code was established under the federal *Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000*. The *ESOS Act 2000* deals with the 'mechanics' of international education and in reference to the national code, Part 4, section 34 stipulates that: 'The purpose of the national code is to provide nationally consistent standards for the registration and conduct of persons who deliver eductional services on behalf of registered providers'.

Furthermore, Point 4 of the preamble of the National Code indicates that:

> Regulation of this industry involves both Commonwealth and State Law. State education requirements are intended to ensure the quality of education and training services. Commonwealth requirements focus on the migration aspects, the protection and enhancement of Australia's international reputation and the need to ensure that overseas students receive the tuition for which they have paid.

Whilst the National Code identifies the need for consumer protection relating to the purchase of education in Australia by international students, it does not address international student security in a general sense. The National Code recognises international students' rights as consumers of education, however, it does not address their rights as employees in Australia (and they often are) or as human beings in general. Information relating to work is available from the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, however, this does not include assistance with work-related problems (DIMIA, 2003). Australia to date lacks a coordinated code of practice for the security of international students (Deumert et al., 2005). Without overarching mandatory regulation to shift the focus from selling education to overseas students to a more balanced situation where the security needs of students must be included in the package, universities are left

to develop their own practices. Issues relating to student security tend to be dealt with on an ad hoc basis. Monash University, for instance, has crisis management teams on each campus to deal with large scale situations such as the shooting in 2002, however, individual and smaller scale incidents are dealt with on a case-by-case basis. If support services are currently readily available in Australian universities, their practicability must be questioned as, regrettably, a number of international students are slipping through the cracks into dire circumstances. Monash International Incorporated (MI), a private arm of Monash University, has until recently been responsible for the marketing of courses to international students, the recruitment and to a large extent the care of international students. By most accounts they have been successful despite a dramatically increased number of students and little change in resource levels. The operations of MI are currently being rejoined with the main university, thus centralising the processes relating to international students with those of domestic students. This move appears to make sense for the purposes of streamlining administrative processes, however, it remains to be seen whether international students will benefit from the centralisation of services. Formal and authoritive university procedures that currently apply to all students, such as academic progress monitoring that identifies students at 'academic' risk, must also be questioned in relation to students from different cultures who have learned to fear those in authority. Many university services relate to students' academic progess, leaving little formal support concerning their lives outside academia. Is it time for Australia to look to New Zealand's overarching *Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students* for guidance as to how best to provide security to this group?

New Zealand's mandatory *Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students* (Code) was in place by March 2002. Established under the *Education Act 1989*, the Code 'provides a framework for service delivery by educational providers and their agents to international students' (Burke, 2004:4). The Code is aimed at institutions with full fee-paying international students and its implementation was evaluated over a twelve-month period from mid-2002 to mid-2003. It was revised in 2003 and continues to be evaluated. It was found that most institutions in New Zealand endeavour to provide quality programs, however, the centrally implemented processes of the Code inevitably caused administrative and budgetary changes that were not always welcome (Peddie, Lewis and Barkhuizen, 2003). Becoming a signatory to the Code tended to be postively viewed except in the case of institutions with small numbers of international students, such as some primary schools that believed they had good processes in place and, consequently, did not see the value in having their policies formalised (Butcher, 2003). Peddie et al (2003) noted that those institutions needing to make positive changes did so and concluded that 'the introduction of the mandatory code has had a positive effect on programmes for IS [international students] in all sectors and throughout New Zealand'. Issues addressed by the Code are wide-ranging, such as ethical recruitment methods and contractual dealings, provision of up to date information ranging from driving laws to welfare facilities, safe accommodation, students experiencing difficulties, and advocacy procedures (Butcher, 2003). An amendment to the code requires education providers to ensure that international students have 'appropriate' medical and travel insurance. Despite needing refinement, this condition provides a good example for Australia to follow. A comparison between Australia and New Zealand policies relating to insurance for international students demonstrates that 'the New Zealand student is much better protected' (Pickering, 2005:8).

A wide-ranging policy inevitably has gaps. The absence of students' educational experiences from the code is notable (Butcher and McGrath, 2004). Furthermore, there is no reference to employment issues relating to international students. This may be a reflection of the fact that is only in recent times that international students in New Zealand have been permitted to work. The policy covers issues relating to primary, secondary and tertiary international students, making specificity difficult – many elements relating to international tertiary students could be comprehensive if covered by a separate code. Within the Code, internal grievance procedures must be adhered to and when a matter is not resolved students can take their matter to the International Education Appeal Authority (IEAA). Complaints to the IEAA trebled after the introduction of the Code, however, this was attributed to increased publicity relating to grievance procedures (Peddie et al., 2003). According to the Education Review Office (2004:1), '[t]here is an economic imperative to support the New Zealand education export industry by ensuring that international students receive both high quality education and high quality care while here'. Academic and social needs, health (physical and mental) and safety, as well as financial needs have been identified as requiring responses (Butcher and McGrath, 2004). Provision for these needs often becomes the responsibility of International Student Advisors who are adept at building 'bridges' to overcome the difficulties associated with the pastoral care of international students (Pickering and Morgan, 2004). Butcher and McGrath (2004:548) 'believe that pastoral care should involve caring for the whole person – that is, the student's integrated experiences, educative,

social, spiritual and psychological'. They suggest responses to students' needs should be proactive, covering 'living skills, health, legal, and safety issues' and reactive in times of crisis (Butcher and McGrath, 2004:548). It is a matter for concern that, despite the implementation of the Code, the responsibility of pastoral care for international students falls in the hands of so few International Student Advisors – for example, Pickering and Morgan (2004:34) found a ratio of '1 Fulltime Equivalent advisor to 400-1000+ students'. Butcher (2003:4), somewhat sceptical about the long-term benefits of the Code, contends: 'The Code of Practice goes some way to addressing important pastoral care needs of [international] students; the rest of the way is the responsibility of cross-culturally aware communities and individuals'.

Conclusion

The concept of security is definable in the abstract as '*a low probability of damage to acquired values*' (Baldwin, 1997:13). This concept allows us to know what security is at any time under any circumstances. A lack of attention to the distinction between the objectiveness of the concept of security and the subjectiveness of the sources of security led scholars to skirt the issue of what security actually means. The main perspectives - international relations/security studies, economic, psychological and sociological - provide examples of the many dimensions of security that fall within the abstract definition. The definition holds firm when the elements of culture and relocation are added, indeed its interrelatedness with these adjectives demonstrates how we can conceptualise security in relation to the international education market and to international students in particular. Thus, the interface of the international education market and student security is identified. The relevance of security in this context is paramount. The security of international students as consumers, employees and, indeed, as human beings is a basic need and a basic right for which we must find ways to put in place structures and implement the necessary processes for its provision. Structures, such as ESOS, are in place to ensure educational institutions in Australia provide quality education to international students, however, provision of security tends to be on an ad hoc basis. Whilst Australian institutions are often doing their best to provide security for international students, a mandatory set of procedures, such as New Zealand's Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students needs to be considered. Whilst the concept of security is broader in context than the notion of pastoral care, the terms are both born with the intention of making sure international students are not in need. To this end, Australia would do well to look towards implementing a modified code of practices. Much is to be learned from the praises and criticisms of the New Zealand model. Existing research on this model presents a valuable base from which to develop an appropriate code for student security in Australia.

References

Adler, A. (1917) *Study of Organ Inferiority and Its Physical Compensation*, trans. Smith Ely Jellife, New York: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co.

Adler, A. (1926) *The Neurotic Constitution*, trans. Bernard Glueck and J. Dodd, New York: Mead and Co.

Adler, A. (1930) *Problems of Neurosis*, ed. Philippe Marrit, New York: Cosmopolitan Book Co.

AEI – Australian Education International, International Student Data – May 2005, accessed from: http://aei.dest.gov.au/AEI/MIP/ItemsOfInterest/04Interest36.htm

Alkire, Sabina (2003) Concepts of Human Security, *Human Insecurity in a Global World*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 15-39.

Baldwin, David A. (1997) The concept of security, *Review of International Studies* 23(1):5-26.

Bénabou, Roland and Tirole, Jean (2005) Belief in a just world and redistributive politics, *NBER Working Paper Series*, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge.

Biber, B., Murphy, L., Woodcock, L.P. and Black, I.S. (1942) *Child, Life in School*, New York: E.P. Dutton and Co.

Bouma, G., Haidar, A., Nyland, C. and Smith, W. 2003, Work, religious diversity and Islam, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Relations* Vol. 41:1, pp. 51-61.

Brodie, Bernard (1950) National Security Policy and Economic Stability, Yale Institute for International Studies, Memorandum No. 33, New Haven, CT.

Burke, D. (2004) Quality Assurance of International Education in New Zealand, paper presented to 18th IDP Australian International Education Conference, October 2004, Sydney, Australia.

Butcher, A. (2003) Export Gold, International Students in New Zealand, accessed 7 July 2005 from: www.maxim.org.nz

Butcher, A. and McGrath, T. (2004) International Students in New Zealand: Needs and Responses, *International Education Journal* Vol. 5:4, pp. 540-551.

Cameron, William Bruce and McCormack, Thomas C. (1954) Concepts of Security and Insecurity, *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 59, No. 6, 556-564.

Canter, N.F. (1936) *Crime and Society*, New York: Henry Hold and Co.

Commission on Human Security (2003) *Human Security Now*, New York. Accessed from website: http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/

Coughlin, R. (1980) *Ideology, Public Opinion & Welfare Policy*, Institute of International Studies, Berkeley.

Dennis, W. (1940) *The Hopi Child*, New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.

Deumert, A., Marginson, S., Nyland, C., Ramia, G. and Sawir, E. (2005) The Social and Economic Security of International Student in Australia: Study of 202 student cases, Summary report, accessed from: http://www.education.monash.edu.au/centres/mcrie/

DIMIA – Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, accessed 6 July 2005 from: http://www.dimia.gov.au/study/working/you_should_know.htm

Doyle, L. and Gough I. (1991) *A Theory of Human Need*, Houndmills: Macmillan.

Education Review Office, International Students: Pastoral Care (2004), accessed 7 July 2005 from: www.ero.govt.nz

Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000, accessed from: http://www.vetab.nsw.gov.au/os_courses/code.htm

Freud, Anna (1937) *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense*, London: Hogarth Press.

Gesell, A. (1942) Psychiatry in the Training, Experience, and Education of the Individual: Family Life, in Frank J. Sladen (ed) *Psychiatry and the War*, Baltimore: Charles C. Thomas.

Graham, D (2000) The people paradox: Human movements and human security in a globalising world, in D. Graham and N. Poku (eds.), *Migration, Globalisation and Human Security*, London, Routledge.

Healy, W., Bronner, H. and Bowers, A. (1930) *The Structure and Meaning of Psychoanalysis*, New York: A.A. Knopt.

International Bill of Human Rights (1948), Fact Sheet No.2 (Rev.1), Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, accessed 9 May 2005 from: http://www.unhchr.ch.html/menu6/2/fs2.htm

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), accessed 31 March 2005 from: http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_ccpr.htm

International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), accessed 31 March from: http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_cescr.htm

King, Gary, and Murray, Christopher J.L. (2001/2002) Rethinking human security, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 116, No. 4, 585-610.

Marginson, S. and Considine (2000) *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia, Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press.

Maslow, A.H. (1943) A theory of human motivation, *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.

Mazzarol, T. and Souter, G. (2002) 'Push-pull' factors influencing foreign student destination choice, *The International Journal of Educational Management* 16(2/3):82-91.

Mazzarol, T. and Souter, G., Smart, D. and Choo, S. (2001) *Perceptions, information and choice: Understanding how Chinese students select a country for overseas study.* Canberra: Australian Education International. www.dest.gov.au

Milner, W. T., Poe, Steven C. and Leblang, David (1999) Security Rights, Subsistence Rights, and Liberties: A Theoretical Survey of the Empirical Landscape, *Human Rights Quarterly* Vol. 21, No. 2, 403-443.

Nesadurai (2005) Conceptualising Economic Security in an Era of Globalisation: What Does the East Asian Experience Reveal? Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation, Working Paper No. 157/05, February 2005, The University of Warwick, Coventry, UK.

Norwood, George (2005) Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, accessed 24 January 2005 from website: http://www.deepermind.com/20maslow.htm

Nye, J.S., and Lynn-Jones, S. (1988) International Security Studies: A Report of A Conference on the State of the Field, *International Security*, 12:5-27.

Oppenheim, Felix E. (1975) 'The Language of Political Inquiry: Problems of Clarification', in Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby (eds), *Handbook of Political Science, Vol 1: Political Science: Scope and Theory* (Reading, MA, 1975), p. 284.

Peddie, R., Lewis, M. and Barkhuizen (2003) An Evaluation of the Implementation of the Code of Practice for the Pastoral Care of International Students, The University of Auckland.

Pickering, J. and Morgan, G. (2003) Barriers and Bridges to effective pastoral care support and counselling of Chinese international students, accessed 1 July 2005 from: http://www.ie-nz.com/pages/research.htm.

Pickering, J. (2005) Medical and Travel Insurance in New Zealand – a lesson for Australia?, New Zealand: ie Limited.

Poku N., Renwick N. and Glenn J. (2000) Human security in a globalising world, in David T. Graham and Nana K. Poku (eds.) Migration, Globalisation and Human Security, London: Routledge.

Rothschild, Emma (1995) What is security? *Daedalus*, Vol. 124. No. 3, 53-98.

Sadler, William S. (1929) *The Mind at Mischief*, New York: Funk and Wagnalls.

Scholte, J.A. (2000) *Globalisation: A Critical Introduction*, New York: St Martin's Press.

Sherman, Mandel (1941) *Basic Problems of Behaviour*, New York: Longmans.

Somavia, J. (1999) People's Security – Globalizing Social Progress, Collection of speeches.

Straub, E. (2003) Notes on Cultures of Violence, Cultures of Caring and Peace, and Fulfillment of Basic Human Needs, *Political Psychology 24(1)*, 1-19.

Symonds, P. (1946) The Dynamics of Human Adjustment, New York: D Appleton-Century Co.

The National Code - National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students (2001), accessed 4 July 2005 from: http://www.dest/gov.au/sectors/international_educaton/publications_resources/o.../introduction.html

Thomas, W.I. (1917) The Persistence of Primary-Group Norms in Present-Day Society, in H. Jennings, J.Watson, A. Meyer, and W.I Thomas (eds), *Suggestions of Modern Science Concerning Education*, New York: Macmillan.

United Nations Development Programme (1994), *Human Development Report*, New York.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, G.A. Res. 217A (lll), U.N. GAOR, 3rd Sess., (Resolutions, part 1, at 71, U.N. Doc. A/810 (1948), *reprinted in 43 Am. J. Int'l L. Supp*. 127 (1949).

Walt, Stephen M. (1991) The Renaissance of Security Studies, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2, 211-239.

Ward, C. and Masgoret A.-M. (2004) *The Experiences of International Students in New Zealand: report on the results of the national survey*, Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Wolfers, Arnold (1952) "National Security" as an Ambiguous Symbol, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 67, No. 4 (Dec, 1952), 481-502.

Wong, Chak-kie and Lee, Nan Shong Peter (2000), Popular Belief in State Intervention for Social Protection in China, *Journal of Social Policy* Vol. 29:1, pp. 109-116.

Wong, Chak-kie and Wong, Ka-ying (2005) Expectations and Practice in Social Citizenship: Some Insights from an Attitude Survey in a Chinese Society, *Social Policy & Adminstration,* Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 19-34.

Young, K. (1941) *Personality and Problems of Adjustment*, New York: F.S. Crofts Co.