1

Enabling Transnational Learning Communities: Policies, Pedagogies and Politics of Educational Power

Michael Singh

Introduction

In responding to and giving expression to contemporary geopolitical shifts, universities around the world are increasingly entangled in intersecting local, national, and global relations. Transnational students are using the internationalization of higher education to extend and deepen their capacity for thinking and acting globally, nationally and locally in order to enhance the viability of their life trajectories. In doing so they find competing university systems offering contrasting perspectives on, and pathways through, the contours of this ever-changing global/national/local-scape. This chapter explores the problematic connections between university imaginings of the internationalization of higher education and transnational students' uses of international education to enhance their life opportunities as global/national/local citizens, workers/employers and learners.

Adopting a transformative perspective, this chapter contributes to the burgeoning debates about the possibilities of bringing forward, reinvigorating and reinventing those traditions which have enabled education policies, pedagogies and politics to respond responsibly to the fiery imperatives of the past. Through the examination of the global/national/local connectedness of particular students, this chapter opens possibilities for discovering how other students—local and international, bilingual and monolingual, majority and minority world alike—may offer important media through which to learn about and develop the attributes required for dealing with the imperatives, uncertainties and complexities inherent in the structures and (il)logic of contemporary transitions in globalization.

P. Ninnes and M. Hellstén (eds.), Internationalizing Higher Education, 9-36.
© 2005 *Springer. Printed in the Netherlands.*

To ground this project socially, this chapter is based on an analysis of interviews with students from the People's Republic of China who were enrolled in the final year of their undergraduate degree, mostly in disciplines related to business, science and technology, at a range of Australian universities. The interviews explored these students' views of how their formal and non-formal learning experiences in Australia deepened and extended their transnational education begun in China, and how they expected to use the learnings they had so far accumulated in their life. The students did not offer a homogenous narrative on the internationalization of higher education, nor did they represent anything like typical transnational students. Each student had her or his own different and particular transnational educational history, and they had highly variable accounts of how they were using their education in Australia to elaborate their pre-formed identities as transnational workers/employers, global/national/local citizens and worldly learners. Further, in itself this focus on transnational students from China reflects and gives expression to a notable reorientation of economic globalization in Australia as elsewhere. From the beginning of the 21st century, Australian considerations of transnational capitalism and politics have extended to China, displacing but not marginalizing an earlier focus on Japan. Moreover, this focus on Chinese students also invites consideration of the role of non-Europeans in inciting innovations in university teaching and learning in Australia, a country still struggling with its legacy of White Australia politics (Singh 2001).

This chapter contributes to exploring the educational significance of re-presenting and engaging all students as media of transnational global/national/local connectedness, rather than as merely sources of revenue or sites of English language deficiencies or "empty vessels" to be filled with Euro-American knowledge. Marketing models have often framed the meanings assigned to the internationalization of higher education in Australia (Caruana, Ramaseshan & Ewing 1998, Gatfield, Barker & Graham 1999, Jolley 1997, Kemp, Madden & Simpson 1998, Lafferty & Fleming 2000, Marginson 2002, Mazzarol, Choo & Nair 2001, Mazzarol & Hosie 1996). Debates and struggles over the sustainable management of the risky commercial trade in higher education have a privileged position in educational policy, pedagogy and politics. This is not surprising given the Australian Government's disinvestment in the education of an Australian public as well as the systems required for producing its 'human resources' and 'intellectual capital' (Dobson & Holtta 2001, Taylor & Henry 2000). Further, where debates over the socio-political, economic and multicultural purposes of internationalizing higher education arise, much attention is given to compensating for presumed deficits. This is especially with respect to English language education and the imagined allures of 'Anglo-American knowledge' (Ballard & Clanchy 1997, Bradley & Bradley 1984, Cleverley & Jones 1976). Alternatively these debates over the purposes of internationalizing higher education have dwelt on the psychosocial imaginings of 'absolute differences' in the learning strategies of students from Asia and Australia (Watkins & Biggs 1996).

A significant gap in all of this research into the internationalization of higher education is the missed opportunities to engage contemporary theories of cultural globalization and the insights they offer into the history, ideological and local

practices of internationalizing higher education. This chapter represents a small contribution to generating an interpretation that brings a sense of complexity to the foregoing approaches, interrupting any assumption that they give the fullest possible meaning to the internationalization of higher education. They have been replaced in this chapter by a perspective that brings to the fore considerations of students as media of complex transnational connectivities. Taking Appadurai's (1996: 33) notion of "global cultural flows" as a point of departure, it might be argued that the global/national/local movements of transnational students (and academics), and their imaginings about moving, constitute a key feature of the current transitions in the practices of globalization. This opens up opportunities for bringing to the front of the imagination possibilities for responsive and responsible educational policies, pedagogies and politics. How might education policy actors enable transnational students' learnings?

This chapter grounds the nebulous and contested notion of internationalizing higher education in the movements of transnational students. They are seen as agents shaping their own life trajectories, as well as agents in stimulating the transformative re-imaginings and re-workings of policies, pedagogies and politics for internationalizing higher education. What then might it mean for the policies, pedagogies and politics of internationalizing higher education if the local and international, bilingual and monolingual, majority and minority world students (and staff) present in universities were regarded as productive media of global/national/local connections? What innovative possibilities could arise for higher education policies, pedagogies and politics if the presence of transnational students—in all their complex connectivities—was seen as a day-to-day manifestation of the nation-state's responses to and expressions of contemporary transitions in globalization? Admittedly, this way of framing the question of internationalizing higher education is as confronting as it is productively stimulating.

By working critically with the compromised conceptual resources of Clifford (1997) this chapter reflects on the evidence concerning how and why students from China are extending and deepening their movements into the circuits of transnational communities of learning and work. In doing so, it explores possibilities for pedagogical innovations that involve re-inventing ethnographic practices of fieldwork. The sections that follow seek to provide practical conceptual resources for making innovations in education policies, pedagogies and politics through the internationalization of higher education. This work is necessary even as education itself is being subjected to, and engages in crass marketization, individualistic consumerism and technological commodification. This is perhaps nowhere more evident than in Australian higher education, which is increasingly dependent on the cash-flow derived from international fee-paying students.

Reconstituting Ethnographic Fieldwork as a Pedagogical Practice

What might it mean to formally and explicitly incorporate transnational students' travels into a cluster of pedagogical practices derived through reconstituting ethnographic fieldwork? The following comparisons of the transnational students and the ethnographic fieldworker may suggest ways of tapping into the former's observation about globalization in Australia, providing a pedagogical vehicle for turning private musings into collective ethnographic knowledge. Like fieldwork, transnational students' travels typically require co-residence, collaboration and advocacy, and involve conducting interviews, making surveys and composing reports about people and their place (Clifford 1997: 59). Usually fieldworkers and transnational students are required to physically leave their 'home' (however that is defined), and to travel to and from, in and out of some place which may be imagined as being distinctly different. The fieldworker is required to engage in intensive or 'deep' interactions by living in a community for an extended, if inevitably temporary, time; so too does the transnational student. By re-making ethnographic fieldwork as a method of teaching, the world's geopolitical shifts might be represented to, by and through the learning experiences of transnational students. Students-as-fieldworkers could investigate global/national/local economic, cultural and socio-political flows, including the import-export of higher education in which universities are already enmeshed, to reveal what questionable habits are being taken for granted.

To get a sense of the possibilities that the internationalizing of higher education has to offer the elaboration of transnational identities, students were asked about the connections they had made in Australia. By actively occupying, and moving through and around space, these students were able to discursively map the field. They built networks with students from elsewhere in China and from other countries. This extension of their participation in a transnational learning community was constituted via their first language or by using an English dialect to make connections across different languages. However, they all had hopes that such a community would be inter-ethnic, including Anglo-ethnic and Other Australians as well as non-Chinese students from other nations.

Languages and Cultural Understandings

The student-as-fieldworker has to learn the local language or dialect in order to speak and listen for her or him self. One student in our study, Ke Chen, learnt about the differences between US/American textbook English and Australian spoken English:

> When we are in China we learn from the textbook, "How do you do?". When I came here the Australians said, "How are you" straight away. That was really confusing. When you read the textbook it says that only when you are very good friends do you say, "How are you?" straight away, otherwise you don't say that. Well, one guy said, "How are you?" straight away. I didn't even know this guy. I had to think, "How come Australians do not follow the textbook?"

The student-as-fieldworker learns to speak the language to a level of vernacular proficiency so as to engage in complex, often political negotiations without the aid of "cosmopolitan intermediaries" (Clifford 1997: 23). This was more than language education. For Ke Chen this involved learning cultural understandings:

> My education is not just from the university. … I've learnt more cultural things. Sometimes I don't understand what Australians are talking about, and I speak English very well. The words can be understood but I still don't know what they are talking about. That's the cultural understanding I'm learning.

The existence of multiple Englishes was something that Peng discovered: "In China our English tests are mostly for writing and reading. We had few opportunities to speak English. Our listening was from British or American English; it is different from Australian English." Likewise Yang recognized that "English" is not one bounded whole, but a complex tapestry of dialects, if not languages:

> In China we learnt American English, which is quite different from Australian English. It was not easy for me to pick it up, but now I … learn English from the lectures, the university and also from my work. … The more you speak and the more you listen the more you pick up … about routine or everyday life words.

The students know they cannot rely on interpreters or translators as in the case of short-term contacts; extended dwelling in the field requires bilingual communicative competence. However, despite preparatory English language education, Ying experienced the shock of language failure:

> Sometimes I failed some subjects here. I never thought I would fail subjects. My mum said that everything couldn't always be good for me. … I was really confident that I could at least get a credit. But I failed. In China I felt that my English is good. … I never failed a subject. When I came here, even if I studied hard, I would talk to the teachers and study the whole book, I could not … really understand. I also felt that some of the local students are laughing at me. … I have no expression on my face. I'm so confused. … I'm unbalanced (Ying).

To mitigate this sense of failure students used various strategies. For instance, Ying elected to learn English through her interactions with a friend from another Asian country: "I live with a Korean. … Her English is really good … we always communicate and talk in English. We're from different cultures so I have learnt a lot from her." Multicultural mediators helped Su to learn this other English:

> I made friends with some ABCs [Australian-born Chinese] … because I wasn't afraid as they have a Chinese face but they act like Australians. … after that, I hoped I could communicate with other Australian people. The ABC's … can easily understand my problem. So I can say to them, "Can you please speak

> slowly, I can't understand you?"

As in fieldwork (Clifford 1997: 57), discursive practices are crucial to the translation, definition and re-presentation of both the 'transnational student' and the 'field' into scholarly knowledge claims. However, questions about the bilingual oracy, writing, listening and speaking of transnational students, along with those concerning the rise of multilingual knowledge economies, tend to be erased. The project of internationalizing higher education seems to be pre-occupied with the commodification of English in language laboratories, something they can do in their home country. There seems to be a lack of preparedness to explore English-only policies, pedagogies and politics in ways that engage bilingual students in more intimate interactions with Anglophone students as part of their day-to-day higher education studies.

Enhanced Deep Learning with Critical and Creative Thinking

Standing in opposition to superficiality, the transnational student-as-fieldworker is oriented towards the production of deep knowledge. Through the educative efforts of academics, Jun learnt that her 'job' involves not only ensuring a deep understanding but also producing knowledge:

> In China the teaching method is more teacher-centred. The teacher talks too much in front of the class and the students keep silent. They sit there and take notes. If they memorise the notes they can pass the exam. But in Australia it is quite different. The teacher stimulates the student's critical thinking and wants the student to become an independent learner.

The students were not provided merely with descriptions of the fields being studied but also with interpretive tools that opened meaningful spaces wherein they produced their own knowledge. That is, teaching and learning are co-joint knowledge producing endeavours that build 'fields' for multicultural translations and give 'work' its critical meanings. The idea of becoming a worker able to produce knowledge was a source of enjoyment for Xiang:

> In China we only learn something that the teacher has told you. … In Australia the teacher only speaks to tell you a little bit, and then you have to do research. … I like the Australian style better because you can do something you like, you can spend more time on it and do things for yourself.

Transnational students used their fieldwork to generate empirical data that puts socio-political, multicultural and economic theories of globalization/localization to the test. This interrelationship between deep understanding and knowledge production underlined Che's comment:

> In China you need to write it down, memorize information, and you get good marks. In Australia … you must analyse the information and figure things out. You need a logical way of thinking to come to your own conclusion. It's a little bit hard for me.

These students have acquired a range of learning strategies. They include those that emphasize the memorization required for a deep understanding of knowledge as well as those needed for the critical and creative generation of knowledge. Their fieldwork grounded their theoretical interpretations through enabling them to generate empirical evidence (Clifford 1997: 52-53).

Group-based Multidisciplinary Projects

Lectures provided Su a scaffold for undertaking team projects in which all members participate:

> Teamwork is very important for you to learn to communicate with others. In the group you have to give your own opinion. As other people have their opinions this can help you to think in other ways to improve confidence. … I made friends with students … from places like Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia because we were doing the same assignments and projects.

Academics were regarded as crucial to the students' learning processes. However, these practices are constituted by distance and displacement as much as by focused, disciplined attention. The academics created situations where Riu was able to take advantage of his contacts, facilitating both the representation of different world-views and the emergence of new relationships:

> In Australia, teachers pay more attention to teamwork … and small group discussions … In China … even though it has a big population there is still no teamwork. Having to work with other people is very good experience.

Team-based projects provided Xiang opportunities for building transnational connections: "I work with people from different countries. I met people in Australia … from Malaysia, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan and India." Likewise Junwen found that her group assignments provided the basis for creating an extended learning community:

> I made some friends when we were doing group assignments and we keep in touch although we've finished the assignments. Most of my friends come from China and other countries … India, Indonesia and some Australian students.

Lectures stimulated Peng's interest by creating a framework for doing the detailed collaborative work of developing informed discussions involved in investi-

gating problems. Xin also recognized the benefits of group work: "We did an assignment and formed a group, then we got along with each other and became very good friends. We help each other." However, Xianlong noted some of the complexities of teamwork:

> The course requires you to do group work. Sometimes it's hard to make a group. Several Aussies are in one group while "Asians" are in another group. … They have an advantage with language over us.

As an embodied spatial practice, these transantional students expected that international education would be constituted by various modes of border crossings, temporary if intensive dwelling away from home, travel, and few boundaries. They expected that universities would deliberately promote and en-skill inter-ethnic teamwork. Their concern about boundaries, about the isolationism of Anglo-Australian students, were reinforced by Ying:

> Some of the groups are all local students; some of the groups are all overseas students. … From the first year until now every group I've been with has been overseas students. I have never had a chance to be in a group with local students. … I really feel upset about this because the Australians want to be separate from the overseas students.

This separation by Anglo-Australian and international students reinforces presuppositions about there being a spatial distinction between a pure, absolutely different home, and home as being a place of transnational discovery. Li made a similar point:

> During the lectures and tutorials we don't talk to each other. So most of my friends are from Asian countries. Sometimes we have group assignments. They don't want to join the Asian students for the group.

While fieldwork was once largely an exclusively Western European practice for knowledge generation, this is no longer the case. Transnational students are observing Anglo-Australians, most of whom have yet learn to think of themselves as Others.

Learning through Part-time Jobs

For these students, learning in Australia was not only informed by their formal education, but also shaped by the informal learning they acquired through day-to-day life, and especially through part-time employment. Many of the students secured part-time work in order to obtain additional income but also as a deliberate tactic to secure significant learning experiences. Junwen designed internet web pages for friends, Jiang worked for an e-business, while Jing worked in an Internet café as a receptionist. Most students, like Li understood the Australian government's visa restrictions on

overseas students working for no more than 20 hours per week during semester and also acknowledged that their parents did not want them to work, preferring that they concentrated on their studies. While tuition fees were paid for by parents and other family members, Yan worked part-time for money to cover additional living expenses. Likewise, while most families made major sacrifices to pay their children's university fees, Ying worked part-time in a Japanese restaurant to supplement her living allowance. However, not liking this type of work, she was looking forward to the cooperative work experience program planned and organized by her university as an accredited part of her course for the following year. Nevertheless, her current job provided her with useful learning experiences:

> I have to work because … I have to challenge myself to deal with different people. … Sometimes the customers are rude. "Can I maintain my balance? How can I do better as a waitress?"

While we are all participant-observers to some degree and at some times wherever we find ourselves, fieldwork is a special kind of localized dwelling. For Yuan, work experience in Australia was a beneficial part of her education: "I didn't have any experience in working before coming here … it's been useful to have some work experience here." Ming, a telemarketer, provides some insights into what is learnt through part-time jobs about the alienating culture of some forms of work:

> I try to annoy people every day. That's a terrible job. Before I came here I never imagined I would be sitting beside a phone every day, trying to smile on the phone in order to persuade people to give me some money. It is very hard. Every day you meet different customers. Some people are very nice. They say, "Sorry Ma'am, we really don't have the money to help you." But others … they receive these kinds of phone calls every day and they are very angry so they swear at me. It's not my problem. It's just a job I have to do. Everyone has different jobs to make a living. I hope they can understand that. I don't really want to disturb them but what can I do?

Ting worked in a hotel in order to communicate with people in different situations. Working part-time provided Su with the opportunity to improve her English, ability to communicate with others, confidence and independence, and her writing skills. Keifung worked in a restaurant because

> The first few years I just said, "Yes" or "No." I am just shy and scared … but I want to learn … then I thought if I want to improve my English then I better work – so I now have a part time job … the good point is that I have to take orders from the customers in English, so I can pick up the language and test my listening … the customer ordered … I couldn't understand so I kept saying, "Pardon, pardon me." Finally the customer felt annoyed, "How come this waiter can't take the order?" At that time I lost my confidence to talk.

To make extended observations the student-as-fieldworker participated by being 'adopted' by locals, learning their culture and language, thereby creating a home away from home. A job as a door-to-door salesperson gave Riu range of learning experiences:

> I found this job so I can practice my English. It's very good. … I make friends locally, talk to them, and share ideas. I actually see that this is really a multicultural country, people are from all over that come here.

The students' work in the field involved more than the work of observing. For instance, the fieldworker might learn that any sense of being a nuisance to the locals may be mitigated by practices of reciprocity. Part-time work for Jiang created opportunities to make friends and learn about and from Greek- and Indian-Australians. Similarly, Xianlong worked for, and learnt from a Jewish-Australian family who owned a retail jewellery business. Due to Australia's multilingualism, Liu and Jun were able to teach in community language schools, working with children and adults. In providing childcare for three children, Jianguo learnt more than she anticipated about Anglo-ethnicity when she took this job which first she saw as:

> an opportunity to learn English. But then I feel a little bit strange with their version of family life. I thought that being Australian, the man and woman would be very equal. But in their family the wife didn't work, instead the husband works to supports the whole family.

These transnational students lived full-time in a global village, sharing the life of those with whom they studied, and those who were under study. They used part-time work to enable them to conduct serious, relatively unobtrusive, and almost panoptic participant-observations (Clifford 1997: 20-22). The students regarded their diversity of work experience in Australia as very important for their future career prospects. However, for these students to grow and develop in multicultural competence they are likely to benefit from inter-ethnic work/language learning experiences that are structurally facilitated by universities.

Pedagogical Reworkings of Ethnographic Fieldwork

Most Australian universities are the products of the power and history of White Australia politics, being limited to nation-building institutions rooted in specific metropolitan or rural centres. These universities are now promoting various transnational experiential teaching/learning practices ranging from study abroad, student exchanges, international internships and overseas field studies. Ideally, such practices provide deep, extended and interactive teaching/learning encounters. However, there is wide variation in criteria and actual experiences governing the length of engagement, the mode of interaction, opportunities for repetition at deeper levels, and grasp

of languages. For education policy actors the question is how might these experiences and knowledge gained by transnational experiences be reconstituted as public knowledge of educational benefit to all?

Transnational student mobility and the industries that it sustains, do not point universities in one historically predetermined direction. Responding to student mobility creates opportunities for innovative approaches to education policies, pedagogies and politics. Innovative forms of multi-local, multi-centred education policies, pedagogies and politics now seem necessary to do justice to the global-national-local political, economic and cultural forces that traverse and constitute not just universities through their many transnational students, but also nation-states. The purpose of enabling transnational learning communities is to provide education policies, pedagogies and political strategies that "accommodate ex-centric residents and travelling culture-makers" (Clifford 1997: 25).

Despite the problems incited by economic reductionism, Australian universities are still sites where academics engage in bringing forward and remaking worthwhile educational traditions. In the face of corporate managerialist resistance, academics are gleaning what they might salvage from a multiplicity of good educational practices, rearticulating them for the changes wrought by contemporary globalization (Pratt & Poole 1999, Reid 1996). There is no pure stance that is possible or desirable in the face of either the dominating neo-liberal ideological project or the resistance and resentment manifested in regressive, parochial politics. At the very least, enabling transnational learning communities could represent a renewal and re-articulation of the responsiveness and responsibility of education to engage the imperatives of these changing times.

Changing Fields, Changing Workers

Historically, ethnographic fieldwork practices of making and unmaking mono-cultural meanings were framed by Euro-American colonialism, but since 1945 contests against continuing imperialisms have contributed to "decolonization" (Clifford 1997: 3). Ethnographic fieldwork has been criticized because of its colonialist history and its positivist legacy that defined the 'field' as a 'laboratory' wherein privileged Euro-American males made their 'discoveries'. Anti-colonialist struggles, postcolonial discourse analysis and critical anti-racist theories/practices have de-centred, but not marginalized, the dominating constructions of ethnographic fieldwork which were the privileged work of White, Euro-American men (Clifford 1997: 63-69).

Following Hooks (1992: 338) we can observe that there is no official body of non-European-Australians whose central ethnographic project is to study the power of Anglo-ethnicity and White Australia politics. However, some non-Europeans present in Australia do develop a collective, but largely unwritten, knowledge of these matters. As the transnational students' interviews above indicate, this is because such knowledge is necessary for them to extend and deepen their transnational trajectory. More than this, such knowledge remains an important source of lessons and insights for all students studying in Australian universities into contemporary practices of

globalization. As argued below, there is work to be done to reinvent ethnographic fieldwork as a practice for enabling transnational learning communities to speak to the disjointed and uneven transitions in contemporary globalization. Currently, ethnographic fieldwork is predicated on in-depth Euro-American interactions with racialized difference. The reworking of ethnographic fieldwork is necessary for innovative knowledge-producing pedagogies to be generated as part of the work of realigning education policies, pedagogies and politics to push through the limitations of neo-liberal globalism. This would necessarily include developing collective ethnographies of the lived knowledges of non-European Australians.

Inherent in the work of re-inventing ethnographic practices that enables transnational learning communities is the pedagogical engagement of all students as media of global/national/local connectedness. Pedagogically, this involves the shift in focus (i.e. power) from the ways in which Anglo-ethnics perceive the non-European presence, to actively expressing interest in explicit representations of Anglo-ethnicity in the non-European imagination. While Clifford (1997) is optimistic about shaking off the colonial legacy of ethnography, there are difficulties concerning the subject position of Anglo-Australian students. Even though White Australia politics may not have the apparent legal or ideological force in Australia it once had, and this is debatable, the political habits for cultivating, upholding and maintaining it linger. When listening to the observations gleaned from the study of Anglo-ethnics by non-Europeans, how might Anglo-ethnic students react? Addressing a similar question in the USA, Hooks (1992: 339-440) found:

> Usually, white students respond with naïve amazement that black people critically assess white people from a standpoint where 'whiteness' is the privileged signifier. Their amazement that black people watch white people with a critical 'ethnographic' gaze, is itself an expression of racism. … Many of them are shocked that black people think critically about whiteness because racist thinking perpetuates the fantasy of the Other who is subjugated, who is subhuman, lacks the ability to comprehend, to understand, to see the working of the powerful.

This shift in focus (i.e. power) to representations of Anglo-ethnicity in the non-European imagination, challenges Anglo-ethnic desires to assert control over the gaze of non-Europeans. It also suggests that their imagined invisibility to non-Europeans is no longer safe; learning to relinquish this security blanket is a challenge. Moreover, enabling transnational learning communities implies that Anglo-ethnics are aided in bringing to an end their imaginings that there are no representations of Anglo-ethnicity or White Australia politics in the imagination of non-European students other than how they prefer to appear. Consider for a moment the likely challenges to their identity such knowledge could pose. Writing in the early 1990s, Hooks (1992: 341) discussed the Black American representations of "whiteness as terrorizing," as being a response that emerged from:

> the traumatic pain and anguish that remains a consequence of white racist domination … black folks associated whiteness with the terrible, the terrifying, the terrorizing. White people were regarded as terrorists … They terrorized by economic exploitation. …Their presence terrified me … they looked too much like the unofficial white men who came to enact rituals of terror and torture. … To name that whiteness in the black imagination is often a representation of terror.

A renewed pedagogy of quasi-ethnographic fieldwork that enables transnational learning communities could generate such powerful and thought-provoking insights as those offered by Bell Hooks in the early 1990s. It is possible that the transnational student presence in Australian higher education might even help in efforts to re-invent ethnographic fieldwork, freeing it from at least some of its "history of European, literary, male, bourgeois, scientific, heroic, recreational meanings and practices" (Clifford 1997: 33). Despite an ambiguous inheritance, pedagogies of quasi-ethnographic fieldwork might be reworked along the lines indicated below so as to be useful in enabling transnational learning communities that give form and substance to a new generation of trans-national workers/employer, global/national citizens and worldly learners.

Pedagogies of Quasi-ethnographic Fieldwork

Ethnographic fieldwork is being or could be reworked in a number of ways. First, pedagogically, ethnographic fieldwork is no longer the exclusive or privileged method of White, Euro-American men. Now, the Other is coming to study Europeans, Americans and Australians (Clifford 1997: 29, 52-53, 60). The global political economy, and especially the market in international higher education, is creating pressures and opportunities for renewing fieldwork. What is proposed here is that the internationalization of higher education might be used to create opportunities for students-as-fieldworkers to turn to Europe, North America or Australia as a field to study (multi)cultural, economic and socio-political globalization, using the diverse relational approaches of ethnographic and historical investigation. Here it is important to be mindful that some transnational students, both local and international, could have ancestors who were once more likely the object of ethnographic fieldwork. With the internationalization of higher education, the range of possible venues for fieldwork has expanded dramatically. The geopolitical location for fieldwork has been challenged, and is no longer secured solely by the Euro-American interests. The borders defining both the 'field' and the 'worker' are destabilized and made the subject of renegotiations as a result of the global mobility of transnational students. Who are the insiders and outsiders in the global economy? Who feels at home or in a foreign place when confronted with the cosmopolitanism of cultural globalization? These boundaries are being challenged by transnational student mobility. The contemporary lack of clarity concerning what now counts as ethnographic fieldwork

opens up a range of spatial practices for innovative academics. Fieldwork is no longer a matter of a White, Western European:

> (worldly) traveler visiting (local) natives, departing from a metropolitan center to study in a rural periphery. Instead, [the fieldworker's] site opens onto complex histories of dwelling and traveling, cosmopolitan experiences (Clifford 1997: 2).

Such teaching/learning experiences may lead to new knowledge being produced for the benefit of the rising generation.

Second, the balance of power has, or is shifting the "worker" and the "field" (Clifford 1997: 41). Pedagogically the focus is on the ethical questions of rapport and reciprocity. For instance, to undertake ethnographic fieldwork among Indigenous communities now, the ethical question "What's in it for us?" puts reciprocity on the agenda from the very start. Thus, expectations regarding reciprocity are raised by students-as-fieldworkers producing knowledge about globalization. This is because enabling transnational learning communities is a both-ways educational practice involving the use and collaborative production of knowledge. The practice of reciprocity may take various forms such as providing opportunities for work experience in revitalizing linguistic diversity through bringing languages forward or contributing to a history project exploring changing global/national/local interconnectedness. Questions of ownership that were once elided in ethnographic fieldwork or subsumed under the patrimony of making a contribution to Euro-American knowledge would be the subject of explicit curriculum negotiations. Pedagogies of ethnographic fieldwork shift the focus/power from developing rapport to making explicit ethical concerns involved in negotiating transnational learning communities.

Third, co-residence for extended periods has had considerable authority in defining ethnographic fieldwork (Clifford 1997: 55-60). The length of stay by mobile transnational students, and the depth and intensity of the interactions between transnationally mobile and immobile students are changing. With developments in high-speed communication and transport, fieldwork as an instance of a situated transnational learning community may involve extended dwelling as much as repeated visits to engage in collaborative work. Increasing transnational mobility means that the time in the 'field' (in both the disciplinary and spatial sense) is short irrespective of whether the fieldwork involves localized dwelling for an extended period or a series of encounters. Sometimes this leads to an Australian Permanent Residence Visa and thus the opportunity to travel and work more broadly than on their original passport.

Fourth, the ethnographic quest for a theoretical framework that grasps the complex realities of any given field or site has proven elusive (Clifford 1997: 48-49). The quest for a single, all-encompassing theoretical framework resulted in fieldworkers feeling trapped by the difficulties of their interpretive task given the complexities of customs and their environments. Pedagogically, we not only expect our analytical concepts to crumble but we are interested in just how far they can be taken

before doing so. Then our interest turns to what has overwhelmed these conceptual tools, what was left out of our overly neat formulas and what is the basis of their incompatibility with other interpretative schema, if any. No longer being able to clutch at conceptual keys like 'culture' as if it is a single thing, the student-as-fieldworker wrestles with her/his role as theorist/knowledge producer of multicultural, socio-political and economic globalization. Fieldwork then helps students to learn just enough to know what vast empirical and conceptual levels remain to be produced. However, without some theoretical scaffold to map the interacting, multi-level patterns in the data, and the interpenetration of the local by the national and global, any hope of deepening our knowledge and generating alternative understanding escapes.

Fifth, the power relations of ethnographic fieldwork are being reconfigured as ever-advancing technologies are being deployed (Clifford 1997: 58). Pedagogically, these new technologies may broaden the range of people engaged in the co-production of knowledge and extend students' access to funds of community knowledges. A disembodied fieldwork is made possible by digital communications technologies, providing opportunities for participant observation of extended (multilingual) communities of knowledge on-line. This means transnational students do not necessarily have to leave their first language/s at home. Notions of travel, boundary, co-residence, interaction, inside and outside that have defined the field and the worker may be challenged as they are reworked through innovative knowledge producing pedagogies using new technologies of information sharing and on-line emotional support. To minimize the dangers of reproducing the inherited boundaries of previous eras of globalization, pedagogies of ethnographic fieldwork could be used to document those dimensions that have been historically erased or marginalized. This involves group-based multidisciplinary projects investigating the social forms of life upon which transnational learning communities depend. These include the technological means of transport and communication; the city and its global/national/ local connectedness; weak (parochial) and strong (global/national/local) senses of home among students; the sites of linguistic interpretation; and the relations of multicultural translation.

Challenges that Extend the Students' Cosmopolitan Outlook

The neo-liberal university offers an image of the world market in education as one of transnational student mobility. However, student travel is not new but has long-established and complex histories. For some of these students from China, their friends or relatives moved to Australia because of wars or in the quest for money and jobs. Others know that their forebears were denied the opportunity to do so, and so they stayed in China or moved elsewhere. This suggests the likelihood of greater continuities than discontinuities in the staging of an 'international student' identity as part of the trajectory in forming the new transnational worker, global/local citizen and worldly learner. For instance, Edward Said (1999) was educated in English schools in Palestine, Egypt and Lebanon. While he completed his secondary and tertiary edu-

cation in the USA, it is most unlikely that he would have gained entry into White Australia in 1951, had that been his family's desire. Edward Said's autobiography suggests that the work of creating 'international students', of developing the skills required to become an 'international student' begins in their 'homeland'. British and Australian colonialism has also made this true for students in many countries throughout Asia. However, conceptualizing international student mobility in terms of 'travel' raises complex problems.

How were the students' cosmopolitan outlook extended and deepened as a result of their education in Australia? Three issues concerning agency and control are addressed below. A major challenge for these students was engaging with multicultural Australia's multiple racisms. The students were aware that the Asian presence in this country offends, perhaps unconsciously, some of those Anglo-Australians (and others) imbued with a deep sense of what the Australian Federation was created in 1901 to achieve in terms of race. The interviewees also reported that there is one group of students which has not made itself part of this comospolitanism, namely local Anglo-Australian students. Their accounts suggest the reasons for this, as much as the desirability of re-locating and re-aligning Anglo-Australian students within the transnational webs of social and economic relations created by global flows of international students.

Engaging Multiculturalism and Multiple Racisms

Travel is tainted by its historical "associations with gendered, racial bodies, class privilege, specific means of conveyance, beaten paths, agents, frontiers, documents, and the like" (Clifford 1997: 39). Perhaps not surprisingly then, as part of their international education, these transnational students had to engage with Australian multiculturalism and Australia's multiple racisms. Jun's experiences of a pleasant life in multicultural Australia were important to her education. For Ke Chen's life in "Australia is very good for the old people and for young kids but not very good for the young people. It's a good country but fairly slow." Denying the assertion of absolute cultural difference between China and Australia that finds expressions in White Australia politics, Yang saw possibilities for alliances and hoping for connections:

> I heard of Pauline Hanson, such a rude lady. … Australia is a multicultural country … it's democratic… everyone is equal but some are just want Australia to be a white country. I think One Nation and John Howard are in that group. It's upset me. When I call my family, my mother and father they say, "It is okay because we have heard from the local newspaper that they said it's okay. It's still in the upper level of society, so it hasn't not deepened onto you." But I can still feel it in some people's eyes, their posture and language.

The topographies of White Australia politics are systematically gendered, involving powerful female symbols, the institutionalized staging of the masculine self

and the marginalized representation of the racialized, sexualized other. The struggles between different interests within and across nations were hinted at by Xin:

> On China's TV they reported that many people in Australia are friendly to Asian people. I saw that as well. So I think that those people here who don't like Asians are not the majority.

Patriarchal, orientalist educational experiences intertwine roots and routes. Wu wondered about the limitations in the global education, in the Asia-literacy of Anglo-Australians adrift amidst multicultural experiences:

> Some Australians ask me if men in China still have pigtails. I felt very uncomfortable because we have done without that for over one hundred years but they still don't know. I can't understand that … They are not very much aware of what's happening outside. I wish they could understand. Even for my lecturers who have been to Malaysia, China and Japan many times, there are still some misunderstandings.

The desire by Liu to make links between people was interrupted by conditions that undermine this possibility:

> When I was driving another man began to shout at me, "Asian man, do you want to fight with me?" He held up his fists to me and said some dirty words. I just said, "That man was crazy. Ignore him." It was very bad. But that's a very rare event.

Women "have their own histories of labour migration, pilgrimage, emigration, exploration, tourism and military travel, histories that are linked with and distinct from those of men" (Clifford 1997: 5-6). White, Western European bourgeois women travellers are marked as special in the dominating discourse of international travel. Rejecting sentimentality in assessing parochialism, Xianlong saw a need for this to be transcended:

> Some people's attitudes are really not nice to Asians. They say, "Why do those foreigners come to my country, stay here and do nothing?" … If you want a job, you have to work hard. … Australia is an immigration country so you need immigrants to come here.

In terms of safety the gender and race of the traveller in foreign lands is a significant consideration. Women who travel are frequently coerced to conform to normative male definitions of their experiences, or masquerade as a male, or discreetly rebel, albeit within masculine limits. The very different travel histories of women include forced sex and indentured labour. International travel is associated

with heroic, educational, scientific, adventurous, noble men, whereas women are typically (but not always) situated as male companions.

Universities as Zones of Isolationism

Travellers tend to ascribe their experience to a degree of autonomy and cosmopolitanness, and downplay forms of movement that involve the forced mobility of labour (Clifford 1997: 34-35). A traveller is thought to be someone who has the security and privilege to move about in relatively unconstrained ways through unfamiliar places. *His,* more often than *her* movement is frequently represented as a matter of bourgeois independence and individualism. This travel myth emphasizes individual agency over structures of control. Their role in ensuring transnational student comfort and safety is neglected; perhaps this is because of their race or class. However, for those entering Australia at least since 1901 the agency of travellers and the structuring of their travels has been

> powerfully inflected by three connected global forces: the continuing legacies of empire, the effects of unprecedented world wars, and the global consequences of industrial capitalism's disruptive, restructuring activity (Clifford 1997: 6-7).

The political and economic pressures that control the flows of transnational students from China and elsewhere into Australia pull very strongly against an overly romantic view of their mobility. Success in the globalization of teaching and learning for Ying meant coming to know others:

> Australian students don't want to make friends with Asian students. … I don't know why. I hoped we could be happy together and share our cultures but I really don't know how we can do that.

Most transnational students move along and within highly determined circuits. Transnational students are located along quite specific routes that are structured, if not dictated by political, economic, intercultural and global/local relations of colonialism, neo-colonialism or post-colonialism. For Keifung, globalizing teaching and learning were not matters of facilitating mechanical contact between local and international students: "Because they think we can't speak English very well, they seem to think we're idiots." That the educational formation of global/national/local citizens does not work on a blank slate was understood by Xianlong: "they are not willing to talk to me. … It takes some effort. … They are afraid. They don't look friendly. Maybe they are friendly but they don't look friendly." Sensing some inability among local students to create themselves as global/local citizens Ming said:

> I can't make any friends with Aussies. … It's very hard for me. … When I first came here my friends in China said, "You will make a lot of Aussie friends."

> But it's hard. I don't enjoy the things that the Aussies do … they go to the footy. I am not keen on that.

Ming went on to imply that the day-to-day pressures in their lives outweigh any desire they might have for building transnational relations: "I think most of the Australians are very self-protected. … They don't want to get involved with international students because they have their own life." In considering the reasons for local students' isolation, Che implies our own self-interests must be transcended to engage the interests of others: "My colleagues from the lab are very kind but sometimes when they laugh, I don't know why they laugh. They talk about some movies or TV programs which I don't know." The desirability of creating new narratives which local and international students can share was suggested by Che: "It's alright to build relationships with them but sometimes it's difficult. I can't share the same stories with them. Some things they know, I don't." It is usual for transnational students to be assisted by companions, translators, agents, interpreters, suppliers and guides. It was difficult for Xianlong to understand how local students see the world, because of the structuring of Australian university life:

> It's really hard to make friends. In China we make friends in the university because we all study and live together on campus … Here we meet people in one class but we're not often in the same class again … Aussie students … make me feel that they don't want to talk to me.

Most often these people are excluded from accounts of university efforts to internationalize education. Yan implied that Anglo-Australians may be surpassed in knowledge of the changing multicultural, multilingual world that is now important to the collective success of Australia, because the imperative to self-fund the increasing costs of higher education:

> In the University I feel the Asian students and the local students don't really talk a lot. … Maybe its because most of the local students are working people or because we don't really have lots in common.

An earlier image of universities suggests a form of gentlemanly travel, during an era "when home and abroad, city and country, East and West, metropole and antipodes, were more closely fixed" (Clifford 1997: 31). Is it complacency or the intensification of work that causes the isolationism of Anglo-Australians that Yuan observed?

> In China you are in the same class all the time. In Australia you are always changing your classes. … Many local Australians are also studying or working part time. … I got to know this local student, and then our study or work changed again and we did not meet each other again.

'Bridge building' attributes are now required of graduates to enable them to carve out spaces as mediators of economic and cultural globalization. According to Jing, transnational students are already expanding their learning in this regard, but it is not apparent that local students are doing likewise: "We don't have many Australian classmates … they are all working, so they come to study and don't talk to you at all. … It's quite easy to make friends with international students." Thus while universities have complex histories of travelling cultures and cultures of travel, applying the 'travel' metaphor to Anglo-Australian students is problematic because of its marked association with the privileges of class, gender, race, socio-cultural location and historical formation. How and whether this problem will be addressed remains an open question.

Mono-lingualism as a Barrier to the Transnational Labour Market

The movement of these transnational students from China is not necessarily centred on a return to their homeland. Their movement depends on how and where politics and economics generate opportunities for their life trajectories. In contrast, there is the possibility that local students' investment in English monolingualism may work to structure their marginalization in the transnational labour market. Su suggests that English may subvert the possibility of Anglo-Australian students having a key role as 'bridge builders' between China and Australia: "I was afraid to communicate with the Australians because they speak very fast. … I don't know how to expand. They seem to rush time. … It's very shameful to ask them to say it again." This leaves open the question of how Anglo-Australians will develop a transnational identity grounded in a knowledge and understanding of other cultures and languages.

The difficult conditions of students' cross-border mobility, which include Australia's immigration regime and a reticent government, have not quelled the deepening and extension of their transnational formation. Former fee-paying transnational students must negotiate a flexible identity, becoming Australian permanent residents while working in China. The lack of comparable skills among Anglo-Australian students caused Ming concerns, as instanced by her comments on turn-taking in conversations:

> We need to learn that you have to express yourself. … When I first came here I didn't speak much and just kept quiet. I think that's a reason why I can't make any Aussie friends. … Aussies, they talk too fast, especially women. … I don't have a chance to say anything and they talk about another topic. When I want to say something, I am already too slow.

Transnational students might reasonably expect to find that their overseas qualifications, including their work experience, will enhance their competition for a place among the materially privileged. Some do not imagine they will be so lucky. Anglo-Australians students have not, according to Ting, learnt or been taught to move beyond parochial, monolingual contexts: "When I talk to a person, they soon become

not patient because I cannot express myself very fast.” Even though migration and employment are crucial determinants of transnational students’ mobility, Zhou was not able to observe these traits among the local students:

> The local students have rare communication with the international students. Some of them are nice. … In class the Australians are “there” and the international students are “over there” ... There is rarely any communication between local and international students.

For Ying, efforts to rebind education with the changing global economy, involves small but nonetheless significant acts of re-creation: “We don’t have a lot of topics to talk about with the English people.” Together these concerns raise an interesting question. What if we were to regard transnational student travel as field-work, an opportunity for innovative teaching/learning oriented to formation of the rising generation of trans-national workers, learners and citizens? What would it mean for identity of those driving the revivification of White Australia politics to learn about transnational mobility from non-Europeans?

Working Self-critically with Compromised Policies, Pedagogies and Politics

There are no neutral, uncontaminated educational policies, pedagogies and politics for discussing these students’ account of how the internationalization of higher education contributes to their engagement in transnational learning communities. Many of the seemingly relevant educational policies, pedagogies and politics have the inextinguishable taint of colonialism, racism, class and gender. We cannot presuppose that educational policies, pedagogies and politics that promote ‘travel,’ ‘boundary crossing,’ or ‘contact’ have self-evident, uncontested virtues. This is not in the least because Australian universities now include a range of European and non-European presences. What is communicated about the internationalization of higher education using these educational policies, pedagogies and politics depends upon their meanings, which have to be “actively produced, negotiated, and renegotiated” as a result of changing historical relations of power (Clifford 1997: 64).

In contrast to Clifford (1997), Tomlinson (1999: 29) argues that it is tendentious to insist that travel is the defining feature of contemporary globalization, because “a huge proportion of cultural experience is still for the majority the day-to-day experience of physical location, rather than constant movement.” While travel is a pervasive feature of transnational students’ experiences it is shaped, if not decisively determined, by the cultural, political and economic structures of globalization/localization. The vast majority of the world’s people are “kept in their place” by their class and gender positioning. This is made evident in the daily repression of asylum seekers from the majority world that is leading to the systematization of “global apartheid” (Falk 1999) by the minority world. Tomlinson (1999: 29) argues that while

contemporary globalization promotes the restless movement of people, the key cultural impact of this mobility "is in the transformation of localities themselves." The ties of universities to their immediate locality are transformed through complex transnational connectivities. This involves the simultaneous penetration of the local casual labour market by transnational students and the dislodging of existing pedagogies of meaning making, such as group-based multidisciplinary projects, from their local anchorages to become vehicles for students to rehearse and imagine transnational learning communities based on networks of business and friendship created through inter-ethnic, knowledge producing projects.

Transnational student travel involves complex practices of border crossing. Their presence troubles linguistic as well as racial, class and gender interactions, interrupting assumptions about the authenticity of cultures or the commonality of transnational student existence. Rather than simply transferring or extending the experience of being a 'student,' practices of displacement are also constitutive of what it means to be a 'transnational student'. Gender, ethnicity and class are integral to the analysis of the freedoms and dangers inherent in transnational student movement. Male and female students dwelling and travelling reflect and give expression to gender specific, culturally mediated experiences. We need to know a great deal more about how women students travel, why some ethnic groups may elect to limit their mobility, and why many more are kept 'in their place' by forces of economic oppression or political repression.

Boundary Crossing

Boundaries are structured by historical relations of dominance and submission. As well as being places of hybridity, boundaries are places of struggle and transgression, and sites of regulated and subversive crossings. The existence of boundaries presupposes politically defined lines that arbitrarily separate and police practices of crossing and communication (Clifford 1997: 246). Because boundary crossings can lead to disputes, conflicts and even wars, they do not occur without policing. Many die along boundaries from exhaustion, fear or the draining of the will to envision life on the other side. The negotiation of boundary crossings is never 'free.' Boundaries are routinely reasserted, often in non-negotiable ways. Perceptions of borders are also necessary to make efforts at alliance formation. As noted above, monolingual English may function as an anti-market, boundary-policing mechanism for Anglophone students, who want to participate in transnational learning communities and the world's multilingual knowledge economies. There are, however, several powerful currents undermining, but not totally destroying, the integrity of claims that transnational student movement represents an end to the boundaries of many nation-states.

First, agents of neo-liberal globalism make use of 'boundaries' to create new political visions that reproduce a sense of their own power. Positioning themselves as subversives deconstructing binaries between one education market and another, they project possibilities for a new boundary-less sphere in which their hegemony will

prevail. This is so despite university boundaries being routinely blocked by budgets and other institutionalized control mechanisms as much as the hostility of the new generation of corporate managers as they misunderstand efforts by academics to enable transnational learning communities. The latter arise, in part, because boundary "crossings are so promiscuous and overlaps so frequent that actions to reassert identity are mounted at strategic sites and moments" (Clifford 1997: 63). University restructuring is a mechanism frequently used to assert corporate managerial control over promiscuous boundary crossings within and beyond universities.

Second, the growing international character of Australian universities is evident in their press to organize markets throughout Asia and beyond. National boundaries around Australia's public universities are being torn down in order to consolidate globally oriented markets. However, because the globalization of Australian universities works both with and against national attachments, it is premature to decree either the end or the consolidation of Australia as a nation-state:

> The world (dis)order does not … clearly prefigure a post-national world. Contemporary capitalism works flexibly, unevenly, both to reinforce and to erase national hegemonies. … The global political economy advances, sometimes reinforcing, sometimes obliterating cultural, regional, and religious differences, gendered and ethnic divisions. … Recurring announcements of the obsolescence of nation-states in a brave new world of free trade or transnational culture are clearly premature. But at the same time … the stability of national units is far from assured. The imagined communities called 'nations' require constant, often violent, maintenance. Moreover, in a world of migrations and TV satellites, the policing of frontiers and collective essences can never be absolute, or for long. Nationalism articulates their purportedly homogeneous times and spaces selectively, in relation to transnational flows and cultural forms, both dominant and subaltern. The diasporic and hybrid identities produced by these movements can be both restrictive and liberating. They stitch together languages, traditions, and places in coercive and creative ways, articulating embattled homelands, powers of memory and styles of transgression, in ambiguous relation to national and transnational structures (Clifford 1997: 9-10).

Third, migration is another related challenge to efforts by universities to dissolve the racialized boundaries through which the Australian nation-state was created in 1901. Changes in the political economy of Australian universities are pushing and pulling students and staff in various directions. The Asianization of Australian universities is a sign of their uneven, non-linear integration into and appropriation of a globalizing education industry. In this process, transnational students are not mute or passive objects blown by the globalizing political and economic interests of the Australian nation-state or its universities. The expanding Asian student presence makes a difference to Australian university communities. The boundaries of nation-states are being complicated by those students who secure an Australian

Permanent Residence Visa and secure employment overseas, often in their former homeland, quite unlike the migrant labour of the 1950s.

There is, however, a fourth important boundary at issue within Australian universities that is social rather than geographic. The social distances that local Anglo-ethnic students establish to isolate themselves from transnational students are linguistic, historical and political products. Australian universities intent on aligning their curricula with the global economy are keen to find pedagogical means for enhancing the interactions among students across these socio-political and historical boundaries. There are important questions to be considered. How is a university a site of travel that makes all students transnational? How might Anglo-ethnic students be explicitly taught to negotiate productive relationships with transnational students? How are local spaces traversed from outside? To what extent is one group's 'core' another group's 'periphery'? While there may be guarded optimism about such trans-boundary teaching/learning:

> there is no reason to assume that crossover practices are always liberatory or that articulating an autonomous identity or a national culture is always reactionary. … What matters politically is who deploys nationality or transnationality, authenticity or hybridity, against whom, with what relative power and ability to sustain a hegemony (Clifford 1997: 10).

For reformists such as Clifford (1997: 204), boundaries can be democratically negotiated. However, crossover pedagogies are neither necessarily emancipatory nor inherently regressive. The question is who uses these both-ways pedagogies, for or against whom, and who has the relative power to win in the struggle for hegemony.

Universities as Zones of Positive and Negative Contacts

Universities do not exist as a socio-cultural whole. Thus, it is not a matter of bringing a unified Anglo-ethnic student population into contact with another totally distinct socio-cultural whole, say 'Chinese students.' Rather, Australian universities are zones of multiple, contested and contradictory contacts, both positive and negative. Many have already been constituted relationally, for instance via the disputed and displaced history of the Colombo Plan in Asia and Africa. All continue to enter new enterprise relations. As these interviewees indicate, Australian universities are now, more than ever before, zones of multiple contacts that involve blockages and policing as much as permits and transgression.

The use of the term 'contact zone' to describe the internationalization of Australian universities stands in marked contrast to the notion of 'frontier' that is grounded in the European imperial expansionist perspective. 'Frontier' assumes the existence of a centre as a gathering point and a periphery that is the focus of discovery. However, the term 'contact zone' is not without problems. The idea of a 'contact zone' suggests a space of continuing historical encounters:

in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict. [The idea of 'contact zone'] invokes the spatial and temporal copresence … [where] trajectories now intersect [and] foregrounds the interactive, improvisational dimensions of colonial encounters … [where] subjects are constituted in and by their relations to each other. It stresses copresence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices, often within radically asymmetrical relations of power (Pratt, cited in Clifford 1997: 192).

Australian universities, which under White Australia politics were historically separated from rather than integrated into Asia, have now come into increasing contacts with non-European students seeking to establish ongoing relations. Given the colonialist and post-colonialist encounters, these zones of multiple contacts involve coercion, inequality and conflict grounded in asymmetrical power relations.

As sites of multicultural performances, Australian universities are traversed by a diversity of students—local and international, bilingual and monolingual, majority and minority world alike. The global/national/local determinations of Australian universities drive them to work through as much as against cultural, social, economic, political and linguistic differences. Those urban universities that are tied into international transport and communication networks act as a point of connectivity and a setting for student encounters as well as sites of trans-cultural knowledge production. Those universities that frame interactions among students who to varying degrees are away from home, are challenged to develop the multicultural imagination needed to seriously rethink themselves as sites of both dwelling and travel. They are sites of hybridized trans-cultural encounters that provide the basis for the serious knowledge production that requires deep learning along with critical and creative thinking. The university is a site of ethno-cultural difference, multilingual diversity and the debates necessary to form transnational communities. It also has a shared social, spatial and historical context that "directly challenges the way these different but related peoples [are] identified" (Clifford 1997: 132).

In terms of aligning their curricula with the global economy, culture and politics this could suggest actively and explicitly displacing the thinking associated with White Australia politics by giving expression to some form of cosmopolitan multiculture (Singh 1998: 12-17). Such an educational project could trouble established controls in Australian universities that reserve the centre for Anglo-Australians and the margins for Others. Curriculum innovation by academics faces corporate managerial resistance. This is especially evident in their efforts to use ever advancing technologies as platforms for 'reusable learning objects' in order to maintain the boundary between teacher-proof knowledge reproduction and teaching-as-knowledge generation. Tactically, such multicultural actions by academics might involve:

the making and remaking of identities, [which] takes place in the contact zones, along policies and transgressive intercultural frontiers of nations, peoples,

> locales. [It is to be expected that] stasis and purity are asserted—creatively and violently—against historical forces of movement and contamination (Clifford 1997: 7).

Australian universities might be regarded as sites of dwelling and travelling. This creates intersecting histories of students from different places with different economic and cultural politics. Understood metaphorically in this sense, Australian universities might be taken as powerful sites of worldly knowledge production and agents in the formation of the 'new' transnational worker, global/national citizen and worldly learner. Travel, boundary crossing and contact arising out of a heterogeneous student population are important to the on-going work of Australian universities seeking to align their curricula with the global economy. Even as academics necessarily respond to and engage with neo-liberal agendas for the internationalization of higher education, the pedagogical reworking of ethnographic fieldwork suggests that there remain possibilities for innovations in education policies, pedagogies and politics.

Conclusion

Universities around the world are being de-structured in response to and as a means of engaging with neo-liberal globalism. The ideological project, the marketization of higher education internationally, frames the academic work of making innovations in educational policies, pedagogies and politics. This chapter pointed to a range of historically encumbered ethnographic practices from which might be derived work points for innovative curriculum practices. This chapter suggested that it is important to work critically with compromised education policies, pedagogies and politics in order to remake them useful in our own field of endeavour. By implication this also suggests the possibility of working critically with tools of neo-liberal globalism for they too have to be questioned, and being innovative in the meanings we make of them.

What then do the main issues canvassed in this chapter suggest for possible university action? The following idea might be worth considering and elaborating in many different directions. University funds might be re-directed to a teaching/research program that took as its charter to deliberately create pedagogies for enabling transnational learning communities. This would be a teaching/research program for students wanting to be part of the transnational labour markets as much as global/national citizens and worldly learners. This program, operating across multiple disciplines could explore the innovative possibilities for education policy, pedagogy and politics presented by a responsive and responsible engagement with the internationalization of higher education. Perhaps the open-ended critical reworking of ideas about universities as contact zones, students as part of the transnational labour force, and inter-ethnic boundary crossing could provide the conceptual basis for generating the rationale for such a teaching/research program. Such an innovative

teaching/research program could serve the university's vision of internationalizing higher education by contributing to the generation of a multiplicity of publicly available interpretations of its best aspirations. Whatever we choose, we necessarily have to work self-critically with compromised and historically encumbered education policies, pedagogies and politics.

Acknowledgement

This chapter has been produced as part of a research project funded by the Australian Research Council. Appreciation is expressed to Fazal Rizvi for critical feedback on an earlier draft of this chapter. I am grateful to Linda and Benjamin for their time during which this research project was undertaken.

References

Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Apple, M. 2000. "Between Neoliberalism and Neoconservatism: Education and Conservatism in a Global Context." in *Globalization and Education*, edited by N. Burbules & C. Torres. New York: Routledge.

Ballard, B. & Clancy, J. 1997. *Teaching International Students: A Brief Guide for Lecturers and Supervisors*. Deakin (ACT): IDP Education Australia.

Bradley, D. & Bradley, M. 1984. *Problems of Asian Students in Australia: Language, Culture and Education*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Services.

Caruana, A., Ramaseshan, B. & Ewing, M. 1998. "Do Universities that are More Market Orientated Perform Better?" *The International Journal of Public Sector Management* 11(1): 55-70.

Cleverley, J. & Jones, P. 1976. *Australia and International Education: Some Critical Issues*. Hawthorn (Vic.): Australian Council for Educational Research.

Clifford, J. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dobson, I. & Holtta, S. 2001. "The Internationalisation of University Education: Australia and Finland Compared." *Tertiary Education and Management* 7(3): 243-254.

Falk, R. 1999. *Predatory Globalization*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Gatfield, T., Barker, M. & Graham, P. 1999. "Measuring Communications Impact for University Advertising Materials." *Communications* 4(2): 73-79.

Hooks, B. 1992. "Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination." in *Cultural Studies,* edited by L. Grossberg, C. Nelson and P. Treichler. New York: Routledge.

Jolley, A. 1997. *Exporting Education to Asia*. Melbourne: Victoria University Press.

Kemp, S., Madden, G. & Simpson, M. 1998. "Emerging Australian Education Markets: A Discrete Choice Model of Taiwanese and Indonesian Student Intended Study Destination." *Education Economics* 6(2): 159-170.

Lafferty, G. & Fleming, J. 2000. The Restructuring of Academic Work in Australia: Power, Management and Gender." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 21(2): 257-268.

Marginson, S. 2002. "The Phenomenal Rise of International Degrees Down Under." *Change* 34(3): 34-40.

Mazzarol, T., Choo, S. & Nair, V. 2001. *Australia and the Indian Postgraduate Science and Technology Market: Examining Why Indian Students Choose to Study in Countries Other Than Australia*. Canberra: Australian Education International (Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs).

Mazzarol, T. & Hosie, P. 1996. "Exporting Australian Higher Education: Future Strategies in a Maturing Market." *Quality Assurance in Education* 4(1): 37-50.

Pratt, G. & Poole, D. 1999. "Globalisation and Australian Universities: Policies and Impacts." *The International Journal of Public Sector Management* 12(6): 533-544.

Reid, I. 1996. *Higher Education or Education for Hire?* Rockhampton, Queensland: Central Queensland University Press.

Robertson, R. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture.* London: Sage.

Said, E. 1999. *Out of Place: A Memoir*. London: Granta.

Singh, M. 1998. "Globalism, Cultural Diversity and Tertiary Education." *Australian Universities' Review* 41(2): 12-17.

Singh, M. 2001. "The Admixture of Indigenous and Asian-Australians: Funds of Community Knowledge, Social Studies Education and the Dissolution of White Australia Politics." *Delta: Policy and Practice in Education* 52(1&2): 109-137.

Taylor, S. & Henry, M. 2000. "Globalization and Educational Policymaking: A Case Study." *Educational Theory* 50(4): 487-503.

Tomlinson, J. 1999. *Globalization and Culture.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Watkins, D. & Biggs, J. eds. 1996. *The Chinese Learner: Cultural, Psychological and Contextual Influences*. Melbourne: The Australian Council for Educational Research and Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.