

**Chapter 2**

**Power, Discourse, Subjectivity**

2.1 Introduction

Having provided an overview of international education’s historical beginnings and its links with the projects of modernization, colonization, and the geopolitical manoeuvrings of the Cold War, I now map the theoretical and epistemological terrain on which this thesis is located. A substantial part of this chapter is devoted to introducing Foucault’s work on governmentality and discussing ways in which it can be used to analyse the discursive constructions of the international university and the subjectivities implied of international students. Foucault’s work is used to elaborate the relationship between theory and methodology, and to provide a rationale for the research design of this study.

I apply Foucault’s work in two ways in this thesis. First, to understand how relations of power produce, disseminate, legitimate and consolidate particular discourses (bodies of knowledge). For Foucault, knowledge is caught up in relations of power, it is neither neutral nor impartial. Accordingly, not everything is visible and sayable; rather a set of rules determines what can be said, written, communicated and legitimated as knowledge and as ‘truth’. These rules are outlined in his archaeological method, which I use to inform my analysis in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine, where I examine the promotional materials used by a selective group of Australian, British and American universities and educational brokers, to recruit international students. There, I analyse the emergence and circulation of statements about international education, identify which statements re-appear, which assume dominance, which are subjugated or disappear from circulation and how these statements function to shape understandings of the international university and the international student. Archaeology also informs my analysis in Chapter Three, where I examine discourses of globalisation to ascertain which objects of knowledge are privileged by globalisation theorists and which subject positions are subsequently ‘formulated’ by these theorisations. An archaeological
reading of globalisation discourses is also useful in highlighting the sites from which utterances are made about global flows, and the legitimacies accorded to these enunciative sites.

Second, I use Foucault’s work on governmentality together with the substantial contributions of ‘post-Foucauldian’ theorists, to explore how the political rationalities of the nation-state work to shape education markets and the ‘enterprise university’\(^1\), and more particularly, how these rationalities materialise into the concrete practices of marketing and promotion within universities. I also examine how these rationales and practices influence subjectification processes. Thus, using governmentality as an analytic, in Chapters Four and Five I examine the policy developments which led to the production of an international education export industry in the producer countries (U.S., U.K. and Australia). I do the same in Chapter Six, where I discuss governance in Singapore. I show how the city-state’s historical engagement with things international is shaping its role as a producer and consumer of international education.

This chapter introduces and discusses Foucault’s work in four areas: discourse (and knowledge), power, subjectivity and government. Using his work and that of governmentality theorists, I formulate my analysis and argument: it is through articulations of power and discourse that our ways of ‘seeing’ the international university and the international student, materialise. Power initiates, creates, and sustains objects of discourse within the field of international education; it produces webs of administrators, scholars, technicians and ‘apparatuses of government’; it influences the formation and deployment of policy and practices. It is by, and through, a set of differentially powerful discursive practices that the international university materialises and the international student is constructed as an object to be recruited and educated.

From the point of view of this study, the following questions can be asked of international education discourses:

- Given the wealth of discursive practices within international education, how have particular assertions assumed prominence?
- What were the conditions that shaped the emergence and consolidation of particular discourses about international education and international students?
- What are the regimes of truth about the international university and international students in promotional discourses? How do these regimes define subjectivity?
- How do the operations of power and knowledge in the international university shape the conditions of possibility for future educational visions?

The structure of this chapter is as follows. It begins with an overview of Foucault’s work and its usefulness for this study, followed by a discussion of discourse and Foucault’s

\(^1\) I attribute this term to Marginson and Considine (2000), from their book, The Enterprise University.
conceptualisation of power, knowledge and government. I also provide an elaboration of Foucault’s archaeological methodology to ‘deconstruct’ the promotional discourses used in international student recruitment.

2.2 Using Foucault’s Work to ‘Disturb Tranquillity’

Poststructuralism, and in particular the work of Foucault, has been credited with introducing a new sensibility to doing research. Two premises underpin this sensibility. First, a Nietzchean logic which seeks to unsettle the Enlightenment assumptions of a human consciousness as the original subject of all knowledge (Foucault, 1972, p. 12.). Foucault argues that there is no ‘transcendental subject of knowledge’ who invents discourse. Rather, discourse emerges from “an anonymous and polymorphous will to knowledge, capable of transformations and caught up in an identifiable play of dependence” (Foucault, 1994, p. 12). Notably, Foucault sees a ‘positive unconscious’ dimension to the production of discourse and by extension the production of knowledge. In other words, he argues that the rules which shape discourses tend to elude the consciousness of the practitioners of these discourses (McNay, 1994, p. 52).

A second informing principle within Foucault’s work, is a recognition of the limitations of discipline bound knowledges, in particular, awareness of their role in constituting the very ‘reality’ that they purport to be studying (Foucault, 1980c; see also Miller and Rose, 1997). Foucault’s critique of rationality and his work on the formation of knowledge opens up a space to think about difference and otherness, something that he argued had been neglected by the disciplines of humanism (Foucault, 1972, p. 12). Although the field of education in recent times has acknowledged the concerns raised by poststructuralism and has moved towards producing a transgressive knowledge regime which transcends disciplinary boundaries, this cannot be said for research on international education which has largely been untouched by poststructuralist debates. My aim in this chapter then, is not only to problematise conventional ways of doing research on international education but also to map a theoretical and methodological framework for an alternative way of studying international education.

The transgressive imperatives of Foucault’s work, and that of theorists working from the ‘post’ paradigms of postcolonialism and poststructuralism, provide new ways of understanding the links between knowledge, power and governance. As such, these theoretical frameworks offer new possibilities for understanding international education discourses. To illustrate, I take as a point of departure, an often quoted phrase used in the Australian context, to describe the development of international education: ‘from aid to trade to internationalisation’. A Foucauldian approach would seek to unsettle the ‘tranquillity’ of the implied progress in this phrase. By using an analytic of governmentality, it would inquire into the political rationalities informing each of the phases ‘aid’, ‘trade’ and ‘internationalisation’. It would examine the translations of these phases into various micropractices. It would also examine how power relations are spatially expressed within the various nodes and circuits of supply and demand in global education markets. Relatedly, an archaeological reading of micropractices, would uncover the regimes of truth underpinning
'internationalisation' and in doing so illustrate the relationality between power, international education discourse and subject-formation. Assumptions of continuity, improvement and progress implied by the utterance ‘from aid to trade to internationalisation’ would thus be unsettled.

By contrast, a modernisation approach, such as that epitomized by human capital theory, would take a relatively uncritical view of the teleology suggested by the utterance ‘aid to trade to internationalisation’. It would assume that all interests and institutions within the network of international education markets would benefit equally. Studies taking such an approach tend not to problematise the largely unidirectional flows of students nor the consequences associated with the growing profile of private education providers. Furthermore, they rest on highly individualized assumptions of competitive advantage, by regarding international students as ‘atomized individuals’ who invest in overseas education with the aim of seeking positional goods. Notably, studies which are informed by human capital approaches tend to disregard the more complex ‘push’ and ‘pull’ dynamics underpinning international student mobility. They don’t acknowledge power relations in the sphere of education, nor how these relations produce differential access by individuals and communities to valued cultural and social capital.

A very substantial body of the research on international education would fall into the latter category. For example, Bennell and Pearce (1997), Smart and Ang (1995), Lawley and Blight (1997), Blight, Davis and Olsen (2000), Cummings (1991) and Jolley (1997) write and research on international education as an export industry. For the greater part, these studies have understood demand as consumers exercising a particular choice for a particular ‘brand’ of education, an overseas education. Similarly, ‘supply’ is viewed in the neutral terms of the university engaging with the real world of business. It is in this light that Edwards and Edwards (2001), MacLean and Pyke (1998) and Poole (2001) have commented on the management and marketing of international entrepreneurial activities. Baker, McCreedy and Johnson (1996) discuss the costs and benefits of international education but concede that they are not able to quantify the non-pecuniary benefits of international education, an omission which has powerful implications for how international education is discursively constructed.

The work of Knight and de Wit (1995, 1997) and de Wit (1998, 1999) explores rationales and strategies for internationalising higher education, although as I discuss in Chapter Four, these rationales are premised on what Marginson (1997a) describes as the ‘second wave’ of human capital theory (pp.110-111). Accordingly, education is regarded as a private good, which is the responsibility of the individual and not government. Other studies have focused on quality assurance in internationalisation (see Van Damme, 2001; van de Wende’s, 1999, 2000; and Edmond, 1995). Again, the dominant logic employed in these studies is one which views education, and international education in particular, as a service industry. ‘Quality control’ is seen to reside in the achievement of goals, targets and performance indicators. In short, all
these studies share a failure to problematise supply and demand trends including the power relations underpinning production and consumption.

A dependency approach on the other hand, dismisses off-hand any notions of progress arising from international education. The normative explanation offered by dependency theorists rests on the belief that international education is complicit in the construction of an academic hegemonic order which silences the ‘East/South’, and transmits western knowledge-interests. In other words, a dependency approach is more likely to conclude that international education remains ‘fixed’ at colonial (aid) and neocolonial (trade) phases. Such an approach would not be able to explain the ‘desire’ among international students to acquire ‘western’ credentials aside from taking a view of underinvestment of education in the ‘South’ (see Jones, 1997, 2000). Notably, a dependency approach would not be able to explain such contradictory phenomena as the dual desire for international education, at the same time as augmented identification with ethnocultural nationalism (‘renationalisation’). Nor would it adequately explain the aspirations of Singapore, which has progressed from third world to first world to become an exporter of international education.

In short, both clusters of theories, modernisation and dependency, are flawed in their treatment of power relations in the international education encounter. Modernization theories like human capital theory, fail to recognise the situatedness of supply and demand circuits of international education; the influence of historical, political and spatial contingencies; in other words, the differentiated power terrain on which international education is located. At the same time, both clusters of theories are also at risk of perpetuating the conceptual logic of colonial modernity, with their totalizing and teleological imperatives (see Pieterse and Parekh, 1995, p. 3; Peet, 1997, p. 82). Foucault’s work, I argue, is potentially useful in opening the discursive space to explore how power and knowledge constellations produce particular expressions of international education and particular desires on the parts of international students.

2.3 Discourse: Definitions & Assumptions

Foucault’s interpretation of the term discourse is broad and not restricted to texts, vocabularies, sets of thoughts or sayings. Discourse is more than just language and more than just ‘signs’ (signifiers) which reflect reality. Instead, discourse refers to practices which exhibit a regularity. Thus,

Discourse...is not a consciousness that embodies its project in the external form of language; it is not a language plus a subject to speak it. It is a practice that has its own forms of sequence and succession (Foucault, 1972, p. 169).
Importantly, Foucault’s discourse is constitutive of ‘reality’. More than ‘representing reality’ it enables and constrains the imagination and social practices:

Discourses are *practices* that systematically form the objects of which they speak...
discourses are not about objects, they don’t identify objects, they *constitute* them and in doing so, they conceal their own invention (ibid, p. 49).

Foucault understands discourse as being rule-governed and premised on a notion of ‘a systematicity’. Rules govern the selection and the exclusion of objects, concepts, theories and norms, in other words, what can be thought and said. The description of these rules is the basis of doing archaeology:

Discursive practices [have] a type of systematicity which is neither logical nor linguistic...[They] are characterised by the demarcation of a field of objects, by the definition of a legitimate perspective for a subject of knowledge, by the setting of norms for elaborating concepts and theories. Hence each of them presupposes a play of prescriptions that govern exclusions and selections (Foucault, 1994, p. 11).

So, discourses can take textual forms, but texts are only a small part of what constitutes discourse. Inevitably, textual productions are surrounded by social practices and political governance which prescribes what is selected and excluded to form discourse (McNay, 1992, p.27). To the extent that discourse consists of sets of broad ranging practices, researchers writing from a disciplinary background of geography have included in the understanding of discourse, the notion of ‘spatial texts’. I take a similar position in this study by including for analysis, not only textual materials but also what Law and Hetherington (2000, pp. 34-38) label as the ‘networks of heterogeneous materialities’; that is, materialities such as objects, bodies, information and landscapes, all of which are performative in shaping how international students experience international education. For example, I discuss the spatial arrangements in international education exhibitions, an increasingly important promotional tool in the marketing of international education, as well as the spaces occupied by International Education offices in universities. Following Foucault (1984, p. 252) who declared that ‘space is fundamental in any exercise of power...’, I argue that these ‘materialities’ or ‘things’ offer an opportunity to analyse power relations within the discursive field of international education.

The experience of international education then, is more than the production and consumption of knowledge and credentials. It also represents an engagement between international students, spaces and places.

By conceptualising discourse as a regularity (network) of practices which shape what can be thought and said, Foucault’s work on discourse can be interpreted as linking the realms of ‘the material’ and the discursive. Discourse cannot be constructed, transmitted and validated in isolation of material (non-discursive) forces. Equally, discourses have significant material effects, they are not simply free-floating and independent entities. As I discuss later in this
chapter, discourses can be used as ‘technologies’ to govern. In this capacity, discursive practices are an instrument of power:

...Discursive practices ...take shape in technical ensembles, in institutions, in behavioural schemes, in types of transmission and dissemination, in pedagogical forms that both impose and maintain them (Foucault, 1984, p. 12).

At any one time, there will be a multiplicity of discourses, some competing or in tension with each other, and others in relationships that are broadly reinforcing. It is this multiplicity which opens spaces for resistance:

We must make allowances for the complex and unstable processes whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it but also undermines it and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it (Foucault, 1978, p. 101).

Foucault thus understands discourse to be embedded in social systems, and because of their capacity to be transformed, discourse should not be conceptualised as fixed, essentialised entities but rather as a window to a partial and situated ‘reality’. While, Foucault has been criticised by feminists and Marxists for being vague about the exact influence that non-discursive influences, such as economy, patriarchy or gender, have on the formation of discourses, Hall (1988, p. 51) and Dean (1994, p.17) argue that Foucault’s articulation of ‘primary relations’ in his archaeological work is a clear enough indication that he saw the material and discursive as informing each other.

From this perspective of multiplicity and materiality, a field such as international education can be understood as a plurality of competing discourses, spanning different disciplines, featuring different actors and producing different meanings which are just as likely to change over time and across geographical spaces. Foucault notes,

More often, it happens that a discursive practice brings together various disciplines or sciences or it passes through a number of them and gathers some of their areas into a sometimes inconspicuous cluster...(Foucault, 1994, p. 11-12).

I offer two examples of international education discourses to elaborate this point. A discourse which originates from a discipline like Business or Economics may make references to ‘priority markets’, ‘new and emerging markets’, ‘recruitment targets’, ‘market intelligence’, ‘customers’, and ‘competitor analysis’. Within this lexicon of terms, human subjectivity is occluded. An Education discourse, on the other hand, may make references to ‘language proficiencies’, ‘academic skills’, ‘critical analysis’, ‘deep learning’, ‘plagiarism’ and

---

2 Critics have charged Foucault with according primacy to discursive forces ahead of non-discursive forces in his archaeological method. In his subsequent work, he accords a more important role to the material (non-discursive). However, it is his refusal to address the problem of determination in archaeology, his refusal to attribute pre-eminence or causality to the non-discursive, is what concerned his critics.
‘originality’. An Education discourse places the international student subject in the position of a learner who is willing to be educated into the norms of a ‘western’ academic culture. A tourist discourse by contrast, may construct the human subject variously to be a visitor with interest in natural attractions or heritage icons, or a discerning shopper who seeks flexible shopping hours, home country cuisine and who deserves recognition because of the economic contributions made to the retail industry, local businesses or national tourist revenue. Sets of naming practices, together with new types of knowledges will subsequently emerge, together with techniques with which to ‘manage’ the subject of these different discourses. The question of which discourses are institutionalised and which assume dominance for national and local governments, for university administrators and academics, or different groups of international students, implies ever-shifting and uneven power relations, and is of interest to this study.

My second example, suggests that discursive constructions of the university can vary across spatialities. Thus, many Australian universities discursively construct themselves as public institutions, committed to public good within Australia. Many within universities would argue that their involvements within the higher education export industry is intended to support this public good role. However, this role changes through the university’s engagement with other geographies of consumers, resulting in its metamorphosis into a private sector organisation, as this senior university administrator noted, “[the university] is predominantly a private institution with government subsidy”\(^3\).

To summarise, discourse can be understood to be an ensemble of social practices through which ‘reality’ is made intelligible. Discourses shape the world and are simultaneously shaped by social and material practices. They have a situated character and subsequently produce partial, situated knowledges which are open to contestation and negotiation (see McNay, 1994, pp.74-76). Understanding and resolving the tensions within these negotiations requires at the very least an engagement with power.

In introducing this chapter, I observed that one area of emphasis within this study is on how international education discourses construct subject positions for the international student. This study into international education then, is concerned with the issue of how discourses are implicated in the exercise of power. The aspect of how these discourses simultaneously pull and push against each other to generate particular subject positions forms the basis of the next section.

### 2.4 Theorising Power

Foucault was keen to distance himself from providing a theory of power because the notion of ‘theory’ suggested a context free, value-neutral and ahistorical view of power’s exercise, effects and outcomes. In place of theory, he provides an analytic of power which, he argues, is able to accommodate the situatedness of power – its historical contingencies, its variable

\(^3\) Interview conducted with marketing director November 2001.
expressions across time, spaces and places, across institutions including academic disciplines and across cultures (Foucault, 1982, p. 184). In ‘Two Lectures on Power’, Foucault outlines a number of methodological imperatives in the study of power. While recognising that sovereign power does exist, Foucault argues that it is not the only type of power in circulation (Foucault 1980b, p. 88; 93-96). He offers a set of alternative propositions. In the first instance, the analysis of power should not be directed at the “regulated and legitimate forms of power in their central locations but with power at its extremities... at those points where it becomes capillary”(p. 96). To understand power’s day-to-day operations, its participants and its effects requires attending to “micropractices or political technologies” (Foucault, 1982, p. 185).

In the second instance, the analysis of power should refrain from focusing entirely on the conscious intentions and motivations of individuals. Questions such as who has power and what is their aim are redundant. The more important question is how power installs itself, how power acquires the status of ‘truth’ and importantly, how power induces ‘truth regimes’ which collaborate to produce particular subject positions and both dominant and subjugated knowledges. In terms of this study, one relevant question is how power regimes within the broader network of international education markets, are expressed in micropractices.

Third, Foucault prompts us to analyse how power is exercised. He argues that power is employed and exercised through

a net-like organisation...individuals are [thus] the vehicles of power, not its point of application. Individuals are not passive, inert entities who are simply at the receiving end of power...power is never localised, here or there, never in anybody’s hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth (Foucault, 1980b, p. 98).

Finally, Foucault argues for an “ascending analysis” of power, whereby attention is given to the “molecular elements” of society, the “infinitesimal mechanisms, all of which have their own histories, own trajectories, own techniques and tactics” (ibid, p. 99). There are several consequences of an ascending analysis of power. First, it challenges the dominance of the “repressive hypothesis”, that power can only be repressive, that a ruling class unified by a ‘universality of wills’ exercises power over others (Foucault, 1980c, p. 119). Second, it recognises that power has a productive quality. Thus:

[power] traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression (ibid).

This position of power does not discount the possibilities of power being repressive, however Foucault argues that where there is repression, there is often a productive resistance. Third, it opens up the space for individuals to act, to exercise power at the capillaries in order to effect social change. An ascending analysis of power thus, provides for an emancipatory impulse by harnessing power at the microphysical.
Using an ascending analysis of power to understand international education markets would mean arriving at the conclusion that power is diffused in networks, at multiple sites or nodes within these networks; nodes such as universities and the places in which universities are physically located; the socioeconomic profiles of these places, as well as the broader educational spaces which feature brokers, marketing instrumentality and consumer markets. By contrast, a descending analysis of power would see its concentration in the hands of a powerful centre, which could be interpreted as ‘the west’, or ‘the state’. A descending analysis of power would deem the corresponding ‘peripheries’ within international education markets, whether ‘the east’, ‘universities’ or ‘international students’, to be powerless with their needs, objectives and ambitions dictated by a powerful ‘centre’.

Foucault’s earlier postulate about power was that it should refrain from focusing entirely on the conscious intentions and motivations of individuals. His later work suggests that it is not always the case that power is exercised unconsciously. He notes in his first volume of *History of Sexuality*, that “power is both intentional and non-subjective” (Foucault, 1978, pp. 94-95):

> Power relations are both intentional and non-subjective...there is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives. But this does not mean that it results from the choice or decision of an individual subject...It is often the case that no one is there to have invented them, and who can be said to have formulated them: an implicit characteristic of the great anonymous, almost unspoken strategies which coordinate the loquacious tactis whose ‘inventors’ or decision makers are often without hypocrisy...power relations are intelligible...because they are imbued through, and through, with calculation: there is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives (ibid).

For Heller (1996) and Pickett (1996), the explanation for Foucault’s ambiguity about motivation lies in his belief that individuals are both subjects and objects of power. They are subjects of power in that they do consciously exercise power through a series of tactics, however, they may not be aware of the effects and outcomes of such tactics.

While Foucault seemed to be suggesting that intentionality underpinned all disciplinary systems, he was less sure whether the ‘push’ was from a human subject or the social body. In other words, he arrives at a highly ambiguous conclusion, “there is a push but no one is pushing” (Olssen, 1999, p. 22). Some of this ambiguity about intentionality is later clarified in Foucault’s work on governmentality. Nonetheless, it is this ambiguity which is mirrored in his conceptualisation of power as diffuse and ‘everywhere’, which has been roundly criticised by feminists as counter productive in organising resistance (Grimshaw, 1993, p. 53).

To summarise, there are two characteristic features of Foucault’s theorisation on power which are useful for this study. Firstly, that power’s distribution extends all the way across and within the social body: “power [is] distributed in homogeneous circuits capable of operating anywhere, in a continuous way, down to the finest grain of the social body” (Foucault, 1975, p. 80). Thus, if ways of resisting power are to be formulated, they must focus on multiple
points within the network of power. A study of power relations also requires attending to the ‘capillaries’ or peripheries as I have done in my study into international education’s discursive constructions through the peripheral and inconsequential realms (micropractices) of promotional materials.

Secondly, power’s productive qualities must be acknowledged as this quality allows power to be self-sustaining. Even if international education is embedded in neocolonial constructs, it should be recognised as still capable of delivering potentially positive outcomes for its recipients. The types of outcomes are variable and could include a western credential which has cultural capital within the global labour market; or a heightened insight and awareness of the links between power and knowledge on the parts of individual students. This in turn, could translate into an ability to refuse particular subject positions. Alternatively, it could increase the capacity of students and researchers to produce transgressive knowledges.

In conclusion, there are a number of key points that standout in Foucault’s conception of power. First, power is not possessed but is exercised. Second, power arises from the bottom up. Although Foucault accepts that ‘top-down’ modalities of power do exist he rejects notions of its all-encompassing effects. In doing so, he creates a discursive space to develop resistant subject positions.

Having identified Foucault’s ideas on power relations, how can his theorisations be put to work to understand the organisation and operations of international education markets? There is already a significant body of research on education markets. This work has associated government-initiated policies of marketisation with the emergence and consolidation of competitive behaviour, both between institutions and within institutions (see Currie, 1998a, 1998b; Dudley, 1998; Kenway and Langmead, 1998; Marginson, 1997a,1997c; and Slaughter’s work with Leslie 1997, and individually, 1998, 2001b). This work affirms the role of power relations both in changing institutional structures and practices, as well as in shaping human subjectivities. Yet, within the context of international education markets, the variable ways in which subject positions are formed by international education discourses has received little comment.

Instead, the discourse of the choosing customer has been held up as a signifier that international education has been a huge success. Hence, the ‘success story’ of international education is narrowly defined in terms of rising levels of demand (see Elliot, 1998; Blight, Davis and Olson, 2000; Bruch and Barty, 1998, pp. 23-24; Hamilton, 1998; Scott, 1998, pp. 123-124). In accordance with this discursive logic, markets are constructed as operating on the principle of consumer choice, which is subsequently translated as a index for ensuring producer accountability. As customers, international students are constructed as choice-exercising, utility maximising consumers. As I show in Chapter Three, where I discuss the links between globalisation and international education, and in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine, where I analyse promotional discourses, assumptions of consumer autonomy and producer accountability are flawed in that they fail to recognise the highly differentiated
terrain of power which engulfs international education markets. I argue that this discursive logic has enabled the autonomous, choice-exercising, utility maximizing international student to co-exist in promotional discourses, with the international student as an inferior ‘other’.

In his later work on power and government, Foucault extended his theorisations on power to understand the interactions between macro-level forces and the microphysics of power. Notably, most of the most work on governmentality was conducted after his death by theorists such as Burchell (1993), Dean (1994, 1999); Miller and Rose (1990, 1997) and Rose and Miller (1992), all of who have extended Foucault’s earlier theorisations on power, discourse and subjectivity. They have used governmentality as an explanatory concept to understand how the deployment of power through political rationalities shapes institutional practices and the desires, aspirations, choices and practices of freedom by individuals.

2.5 Power and Government

The challenges presented by globalisation demand alternative ways of analysing power and politics. In a world characterised by rapid, intensive, informational and capital flows, where social relations and institutions are disembedded, control over longer spans of time and space are best achieved by eliciting the cooperation and complicity of individuals (see Allen, 1999, pp. 198-1999; Lingard, 2000b; Miller and Rose, 1990; Rose, 1999, pp. 143-145). Furthermore, the demands of the ‘knowledge-based society’ require a specific form of governing where the aim is not to produce ‘docile bodies’ but to develop enterprising, self-governing, entrepreneurial individuals whose productivity will enrich the nation (see Dean, 1999, pp. 57-58; 158-59). It is in educational institutions that much of this ‘crafting’ of subjects takes place.

At its simplest then, governmentality is premised on a looser form of power where the exercise of power by the self on the self is paramount and where the cooperation of individuals is harnessed by the nation-state (Foucault, 1980d, p. 58, 1991a, pp. 102-104; Rose, 1999, pp. 1-14; and Dean, 1999, pp. 205-206). Governmentality’s usefulness for this study, lies in its ability to reveal the plural ways in which the exercise of power by the state influences individual choices and desires and more importantly, how such power, shapes subject positions.

2.5.1 Defining Governmentality

Governmentality is a model of governance which harnesses the productive capacities of individuals so as to govern entire populations. Individuals internalise the effects of power and regulate themselves towards ends that are congruent with the forms and effects of power deployed by the state (Foucault, 1991a, pp. 91-94; Miller and Rose, 1990, p. 2). This government of the self takes place in, and against a backdrop of self-improvement, and includes a belief that the well being of the individual is linked with the health and strength of the state. Rose (1999a, p. 145) puts it succinctly “[there is] no longer a conflict between the self interest of the...subject and the patriotic duty of the citizen”.
In defining governmentality, Foucault (1991a, p. 102) refers to: an ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target populations, as its principal form of knowledge, political economy, and as its essentially technical means apparatuses of security. (my emphasis)

Elsewhere, Foucault defines government as something that is more comprehensive than just the state, involving instead, “the conduct of conduct” (1982, pp. 220-1; see also Miller and Rose, 1990, p. 3). Government is thus, a multifaceted entity: it has a rational element (“mentality”), an adroit and subtle touch to it (“arts”), and a set of technologies and techniques (“regimes”). In Dean’s words, “government is an undertaking conducted in the plural” (1999, p. 10). Dean elaborates Foucault’s explication of government with this comprehensive definition:

Government is any more or less calculated and rational activity, undertaken by a multiplicity of authorities and agencies, employing a variety of techniques and forms of knowledge that seeks to shape conduct by working through our desires, aspirations, interests and beliefs, for definite but shifting ends and with a diverse set of relatively unpredictable consequences, effects and outcomes (Dean, 1999, p. 11). (my emphasis)

It is clear that government has both discursive and material features and both are inextricably linked. How are the aspirations of the state connected to the actions of organisations like universities and the ambitions, desires and beliefs of individuals such as international students? It is by focusing on political discourse, what theorists label political rationalities, that the links between state and subjectivity can be understood. The functions of political rationalities, and their expressions are thus key to understanding the ‘government of education’ at both the sites of production and consumption.

Political Rationalities

Rose and Miller (1992, pp. 178-179) have identified three features of political rationalities which help us to understand their persuasive powers. First, political rationalities have “a characteristically moral form”. They are framed in the language of ethics, proper action by authorities, ideals or principles. For example, notions such as “freedom, justice, equality, mutual responsibility, economic efficiency, growth, fairness, citizenship, national prosperity, rationality” (ibid, p. 179) and national security (see also Dean, 1999, pp. 31-32). As I elaborate in Chapter Four and Chapter Five, a number of these rationalities such as national competitiveness and economic productivity have been key to shaping international education policies in all three producer countries.

Second, political rationalities have an epistemological character. They are articulated with the nature of the objects to be governed in mind, be it, society, the nation, population, the economy or something else (p. 179). Third, a distinctive idiom is used to express political discourse. Rose and Miller (1992) observe that this idiom is more than rhetoric, it is “a kind of intellectual
machinery or apparatus for rendering reality thinkable in a particular way” (p. 179). They summarise their description of political rationalities as “morally coloured, grounded upon knowledge and made thinkable through language” (p. 179).

In other words, governmentality has a discursive character. Analysing the language in which discourse is framed is instructive in illuminating the intellectual technology used to govern (see also Miller and Rose, 1990, pp. 4-7). Additionally as I show in this study, the growing influence of the visual register in communication environments means that images too, are part of a technology of government (see Evans and Hall, 1999; Hall, 1997a; Kress, 1996).

Pastoral Power and Reason of State

Two political rationalities identified by governmentality theorists, which are key to understanding the government of education are ‘pastorship’ and ‘reason of state’ (McNay, 1994, pp. 117-121; Dean, 1999, p. 84-84). Both represent important dimensions of governance, and are useful for understanding the workings of the state in both Australia and Singapore. More specifically both rationalities are pivotal to the ‘government by processes’ (‘governmentalization of the state’) which is a feature of many present-day nation-states where governing can be said to involve the deployment of multifarious practices (Foucault, 1991b, p. 90-92).

The notion of pastorship is central to understanding pastoral power4. In describing, the power that resides in pastorship (pastoral power), Foucault notes:

it is a form of power whose ultimate aim is to assure individual salvation... it looks after the whole community [and] each individual... this form of power cannot be exercised without knowing the inside of people’s minds, without exploring their souls, without making them reveal their innermost secrets. It implies a knowledge of the conscience and and ability to direct it... (Foucault, 1982, p. 214).

Pastoral power then, has both individualising and totalizing dimensions. These manifest in care of the individual, as a fundamental component of building solidarities; that is, ‘keeping the flock together’ (Dean, 1999, pp. 79-80; McNay 1994, pp. 118-121).

In the contemporary western liberal state, pastoral power is assimilated with biopower, with the ostensible aim of augmenting the well-being of individuals and the population as a whole.

4. According to Foucault, the notion of pastorship originates from Hebrew and Christian traditions (Foucault, 1982, p. 213). It is a form of power that uses the relationship between a shepherd and his flock to articulate the responsibilities and rights of leaders and their flocks. Without the shepherd, the flock effectively disintegrate into disparate individuals, all of who are now much more vulnerable to external dangers. The relationship of the shepherd to his flock then, assumes primacy over his relationship to the land and in scholarly parlance it is suggestive of a relationship which translates into a deterritorialised modality. The shepherd’s role is to ensure salvation of his charges by giving meticulous attention to the details of their care (see Dean, 1999, pp. 79-80; McNay 1994, pp. 118-121).
The exercise of this power is through the use of various governmental technologies, some of which may be regarded as apparatuses of security. Here, Foucault (1982) argues;

I don’t think that we can consider the modern state as an entity that developed above individuals, ignoring what they are and even their very existence (p. 214)...it is about ensuring the salvation in this world... [using] a series of ‘worldly’ aims (p. 215).

It is in this light that programmes such as mass schooling, public health care and housing and income security are administered by the state so as to ‘care’ for the populace. It can be argued, that colonialism in its later phases operated along the lines of pastorship by claiming the civilizing and educating imperative. Similarly, the imperialising persuasions of the Cold War era rested on a pastorship of caring by introducing ‘free’ markets and ‘democracy’ to ‘others’. In deploying their ‘duty of care’ to individual citizens, these apparatuses are informed by policies, laws, rules and regulations. However, they often end up regulating and controlling individuals and whole populations. Such a mode of ‘care and control’, operates through extant micro-fields of power, for example, by working through the notions of motherhood, gender relations, family structure, morality and understandings of economy (Rose, 1999, p. 15).

The notion of pastorship is useful in understanding governance not only in western liberal democracies, like the United States, United Kingdom and Australia, but is also a powerful conceptual instrument to understand governance in Singapore where the governing People’s Action Party (PAP) continues to enjoy popular support, despite being labelled authoritarian. Pastorship has been a key dimension of the PAP’s governance, an attribute that has distinguished the city-state from its oligarchic neighbour, Indonesia. I will elaborate on this theme further in Chapter Five where I discuss the PAP’s historical deployment of pastorship and ‘reasons of state’ rationalities from independence onwards.

I turn now to a second rationality that is key to understanding the government of education, ‘reason of state’. It has the following features: first, it is an ‘mentality’ of government that adheres to rational rules and is concerned with the state, which is seen to be a ‘natural’ form. Second, it is an ‘art’ insofar as it is informed by nuanced and subtle exercises of power. Third, and most importantly, the aim of this rationality is to reinforce the state by ensuring its strength and well-being and by protecting it from real and imagined threats, both external and internal (Dean, 1999, pp. 84-86; Rose, 1999, pp. 24-26).

To this end, a variety of discursive techniques can be deployed to reinforce the state’s wellbeing and strength. For example, as I discussed in Chapter One, international education during the colonial and educational aid eras, was informed by rationales of national security and national interest. A more recent example illustrating the emergence of a reason of state rationality is seen in official pronouncements on the knowledge-based economy in Singapore, the U.K. and Australia. Additionally, reason of state rationalities can also be expressed in the form of ‘resentment’ discourses, as the work of McCarthy and Dimitriadis (1998, 2000) affirms. By creating binaries of ‘otherness’, these discourses normalise myths of an imagined, essential
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and territorially bounded cultural purity and cultural integrity. In this way, a reason of state rationality can be used to galvanize citizens to unite against ‘outsiders’. I will elaborate on this theme further in Chapter Four and Chapter Five, when I examine how a discourse of national interest, is used to inform the international education export industry in all three producer countries.

However, political rationalities like all discursive practices, should not be regarded as fixed or essentialised. Rather, they are historically contingent and differ across spatial, national, cultural and social contexts (Rose, 1999, pp. 270-271). Besides identifying political rationalities, governmentality is also a means of understanding governance as ‘the self acting on the self’. Foucault’s earlier work focused on the ‘submission of subjectivity’ to power, that is, how individuals are integrated into mechanisms of power. However, in his later work on government, he had created the discursive space for discussions on how human beings can resist being made subjects.

Technologies of the Self

It is in Foucault’s work on the technologies of self that he is most explicit in challenging the ‘submission of subjectivity’ which he raises but does not resolve in works like Archaeology of Knowledge (1972) and Discipline and Punishment (1975). By proposing the concept of technologies of the self, or “how an individual acts upon himself”, Foucault opens up ways of thinking about resistance as an initial step towards devising new forms of subjectivity (Foucault, 1988b, p. 19). He pointedly observed;

the target today is not to discover what we are, but to refuse what we are... the political, ethical, social, philosophical problem of our days is not to try to liberate the individual from the state and from the state’s institutions, but to liberate us both from the state and from the type of individualisation which is linked to the state. We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this kind of individuality which has been imposed on us for several centuries (Foucault, 1982, p. 216).

Foucault argues that his work has been to “show people that they are much freer than they feel” (1988a, p. 10). Technologies of the self, Foucault observes, allow individuals to effect operations on their “bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct and way of being, to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection...”(Foucault, 1988b, p. 18). Here, he recognises the relationships between truth, power and the self. More specifically, Foucault acknowledges the links between care of the self and ethics of the self. To refuse ascriptions (subject positions), to know the limits of freedom, to explore the ‘other’, to push the limits of parameters of freedom is to engage in resistance; all these undertakings, according to Foucault, require ‘a care of the self’ (see McNay, 1994, pp. 145-149).

Foucault is also deeply concerned with building an awareness so that people do not immortalise truth and evidence. Truth and evidence, are not universal but arbitrary and
historically contingent and as such must be criticised, reviewed and abandoned if necessary. Disciplinary knowledge is treated with a similar diffidence; its role in transforming human beings into particular subject positions is the topic of several of Foucault’s books. It is also the basis of much of the subsequent work by governmentality theorists. Miller and Rose’s (1997) study of the work undertaken by the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations is a cautionary tale about accepting knowledge as truth. They draw attention to the role played by the ‘psy’ disciplines in constructing the consuming subject and the collusive role of education and research institutions in ‘mobilizing the consumer’. An influential research organisation with expertise on human relations, the Tavistock Institute had prided itself for using knowledge to positive ends, such as, furthering understandings into social institutions such as marriage, family and workplace relations. However, the Institute’s dedication to its consultancy work in marketing manifested in its producing knowledge about ways of marketing soft toilet tissue, and understanding housewives’ attitudes to frozen fish shapes (p. 31).

Care of the self is key to the realisation of alternative subjectivities to those that are currently promoted by governments of the day. When informed by the principles of ethical self-formation, technologies of the self can offer a series of potentially liberating opportunities for human agency (Foucault, 1996). As I will argue in Chapter Four, the predominant discourse in international education seeks to construct subject positions which are concurrent with aspirations and desires intended to further the goals of consumer and informational capitalism.

However, technologies of the self can be co-opted not only by disciplinary knowledge, but also by, and through, particular political rationalities. Neoliberal forms of government are noted for blurring all distinctions between the economic and non-economic spheres of life. Put simply, neoliberal governance is identified with a political rationality which seeks to develop a congruence between the economic subject – the rational, utility maximizing individual – and the responsible, self-sufficient, moral individual (see Burchell, 1993, pp. 324-325; Lemke, 2001, pp. 201-203; Marshall, 1995; Miller and Rose, 1990, 1997; Rose, 1999, pp. 230-232). Through a series of nuanced, processes of normalization, autonomization and responsibilization, the moral individual works upon him/herself to be self-sufficient, thus enabling political
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5. Foucault (1997) observes a relational element to be an intrinsic part of the ‘care of self’. Caring for oneself must also due regard to other relationships. For the Stoics, a regime of care requires attending to a host of activities and practices: reflection, introspection, attending to “the nuances of life, mood, reading...writing, reflection” (p. 232-233). In his genealogy of ethics, Foucault traced notions of ethics from Greco-Roman to modern times. He observed that Plato’s maxim, ‘know thyself’ as an informing principle of moral development was later adopted by the Christians and went on to transcend the fundamental ethical premise of ‘take care of yourself’ (ibid, p. 228) which was proposed by the Stoics in Greek society. The Christian understanding of ethical development, is anchored in the guiding principle, ‘know thyself which in Foucault’s eyes is associated with renunciation of the self and reality. Know thyself, according to Foucault is associated with a renunciation of the self and reality and a concentrated effort to achieve another level of reality. By contrast, askesis, a stoic technology of the self, which features such exercises where the individuals put themselves in situations where they consider how they can use the discourses at their disposal to confront events and situations (Foucault, 1997, pp. 238-239). Askesis and the stoic principle of care of the self facilitates the intensification of subjectivity.
government to relinquish its responsibilities for providing security, health care, education and so on for its citizens.

Additionally, as highlighted by Miller and Rose (1997), a neoliberal political rationality can be sustained by steering citizens towards the subject positions of desiring consumers and productive economic citizens. Thus, governing one’s self could involve acquiring particular objects of desire and realising particular aspirations and personal ambition, for example, the acquisition of education credentials. In the Singaporean context, the practices of liberty are defined in terms of consumption and entrepreneurialism. The desired objects of liberty are termed the “5 C’s”: credit card, car, condominium, cash and country club memberships (see Chua, 1999, George, 2000, Tan, 2000). At the same time, technologies of individualisation and responsibilization are deployed by the state which are aimed at reminding Singaporeans that ‘no one owes them a living’. What has emerged is a rationality of ‘competitive anxiety’ (Chua, 1998; Rodan, 2001).

Having introduced the key dimensions of governmentality – government by others (including the state) and government by the self – the next section looks at how knowledge and intellectual labour are implicated in the exercise of power.

2.5.2 Power/Knowledge

For Foucault, discourse is both an instrument, and object of power. Discourse subjects at the same time as it is subjected. Thus, “...Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines it and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it (Foucault, 1978, p. 101).

Writing about the ‘subjection’ of discourse, Foucault observes further:

in any society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed according to a number of procedures whose role is to avert its powers and its dangers, to master the unpredictable event (Foucault, 1971, pp. 10-11).

In other words, a set of rules underpinned by power relations function to shape discourse. These rules are discernible using Foucault’s archaeological method. Both ‘internal’ and ‘external’ relations of power are identified as influencing the ‘production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of discourse’. Briefly, the external forces which delimit discourse are described as ‘procedures of exclusion’ and include ‘prohibition’, ‘division and rejection’ and the ‘will to truth’. Here Foucault argues,

we know perfectly well that we are not free to say anything, that we cannot speak of anything, when and where we like, and that just anyone, in short, cannot speak of just anything (ibid, p. 8).

One dimension of prohibition is ‘the taboo of the object’: not all things can be spoken about at any time and in any place. Thus, not everything can be written and spoken about in promotional material – some topics will remain taboo. For example, promotional materials are
unlikely to make references to episodes of racism that international students may encounter during their overseas study sojourn, nor are they likely to refer to the limited friendships between international and local students (see Chen, 1999; Smart, Volet and Ang, 2000; Volet and Ang, 1998; Volet and Tan-Quigley, 1999; and Zimmerman, 1995).

A second procedure of exclusion operates along the lines of ‘division and rejection’. Accordingly certain utterances are rejected by complex processes anchored in dividing and sorting, for example the right from the wrong, the irrational from the rational, the sane from the mad. For example, ‘rational’ discourses often function to exclude the discourses and experiences of the ‘irrational’ other (Foucault, 1971, pp. 12-13; see also Mc Nay, 1994, p. 86). Historically, the discourses of women, indigenous people, and many non-western people, along with other minorities, have been constructed as ‘irrational’, and their knowledges subsequently subordinated. These binaries between rational and non-rational continue to influence academic, political and media discourses, a theme I elaborate further in Chapter Three, when I review writings on globalisation. A third procedure of exclusion is captured by ‘a will to truth’ whereby a distinction is made between ‘true’ and ‘false’ knowledges. Again, this rule is significant in influencing the distribution and valorization of particular knowledges ahead of others. These dominant knowledges, decree the ‘truths’ about international education, and ‘truths’ about globalisation. They are subsequently put to work in favour of particular power regimes (Foucault, 1971, 1991b; see also Heikkinen, Silvonen, Simola, 1999).

At the same time, a series of ‘internal processes’ from within discourse can work to delimit discourse. First, there is the principle of ‘commentary’. By this, Foucault refers to the proliferation of interpretations by various authors about the ‘true meaning’ of primary texts. They are secondary narratives which accumulate to build a textual hierarchy about what can be said or thought about a particular topic or theme. This mass of commentary has the potential then, to produce new discourse. One dimension of commentary is the citational network, which is based on the practices of citing the works of particular authors to support or alternatively dismiss their standpoints. I discuss the role of the citational network in producing an aspatial and power-neutral discourse on globalisation in Chapter Three.

For now, what is notable is the extent to which academic commentary both influences, and is shaped by the political economy of the academy. Along with the other internal rules, commentary plays a key role in establishing the conditions of possibility of contemporary and future scholarly work by constructing dominant and subordinate knowledges. This is particularly so in this current era where particular notions of performativity have assumed dominance (Ball, 2000; Broadhead and Howard, 1998; Ozga, 1998; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; see also Miller and Rose, 1997). Furthermore, as I will show in my analysis of academic
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6 Ball (2000, p. 1) defines performativity as “a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation, or a system of terror... that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of control, attrition and change. The performances (of individual subjects or organisations) serve as measures of productivity output or displays of quality...”
commentary on the ‘Asian learner’, the citation network has privileged particular works. In
doing so, it highlights particular domains of objects for research, policy and practice ahead of
others, thereby constructing particular ‘regimes of truth’ about, for example, the learning
abilities and subject positions of the international student.

The notion of author is another of the internal rules that Foucault associates with the ‘dual
subjection’ of discourse. Commonly used as an organising principle in scholarly discourses,
the analysis of authors’ works is often associated with a preoccupation to find connecting
threads, repetition and sameness, in short, a ‘discursive unity’. Additionally, power relations
within the academy will work to elevate particular authors ahead of others. Finally, there are
the academic disciplines which work to keep the production of discourse within particular
limits. Only certain objects are talked about and then only in certain ways within disciplinary
paradigms. I argue later that it is this ‘disciplining’ at the hands of the discipline of Education,
which has resulted in a proliferation of studies on the learning problems of international
students. On the other hand, those writing from a Business perspective have targeted as
objects of research, revenues from educational markets and ways of increasing market-share.
These studies have arrived at largely laudatory pronouncements on the successes of the
international education export industry. By contrast, those writing from the field of
Development Studies, have focused on such topics as uneven development, the uneven
distribution of professional skills in the overseas trained, and the risk of a third world to first

Foucault summarises this potentially constraining power of disciplines in powerful language,
noting that,”within its own limits, every discipline recognises true and false propositions but
it repulses a whole teratology of learning.” (Foucault, 1971, p. 16). In other words, before a
proposition can be admitted into a discipline it must conform to particular criteria of truth and
falseness. These criteria are influenced by “monsters on the prowl” [teratogens] whose forms
alter with the history of knowledge (ibid) and which invariably work against learning (ibid).

A third group of rules which control discourse, resides in the conditions in which discourse is
communicated. Far from being freely exchanged, there are communication constraints on the
circulation of discourses. A framework of ritual defines the qualifications required of the
speaking subject. These qualifications include behaviours, gestures and knowledge that must
accompany the discourse. The circulation of discourse is also influenced by fellowships of
discourse whose “function is to preserve or to reproduce discourse...in order that it should
circulate within a closed community” (Foucault, 1971, p. 18). Thus, the acts of speaking and
writing, the institutional contexts in which utterances are made and the qualifications of the
speakers who make up the fellowships of discourse, are critical in understanding how some
discourses have more credibility and authority than others. The rules surrounding the
communication and transmission of discourse has been a consistent part of Foucault’s work.

The relationality between power and knowledge is elaborated further by governmentality
theorists, who have drawn attention to the use of expert systems and disciplinary knowledge
to govern. Theorisations, procedures of examination and assessment, the development of surveys, audits, league tables, techniques of notation, computation and calculation, all constitute technologies of government and all are subsequently informed by knowledge regimes (Broadhead and Howard, 1998; Lemke, 2001; Rose and Miller, 1992). The use of the discourse of quality assurance to govern higher education and international education is one example which I discuss in detail in Chapter Four when I examine how market-based accountability, and managerial accountability systems, shape institutional practices in international education. At the national level, in Britain and Australia, instrumentalities like the recently established Australian Universities Quality Agency, and the British-based Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) occupy a prolific role in monitoring institutional practices, procedures and standards through institutional audits.

Perhaps one of the most important technologies of government within higher education, is the funding mechanisms employed by the state. These comprise a set of highly influential ‘calculative technologies’ which work to steer institutions towards particular ends (Rose and Miller, 1992, p. 185). They involve competitive funding models which feature defined bidding criteria and performance related outcomes (Polster and Newsom, 1998). They are a form of governance based on ‘steering from a distance’, aimed at producing a culture of compliance with the state’s goal to inculcate an entrepreneurial rationality within universities (see Berman, 1998, pp. 216-224; Lingard and Blackmore, 1997; Marginson, 1997a, pp. 229-230; 246-247; Marginson and Considine, 2000, pp. 236-243; Meek, 2000, pp. 34-36; Meek and Wood, 1997, pp. 264-270; Preston, 2001, pp. 355-360).

League tables are a recent but powerful technology of government. In the field of international education, Asia’s Best Universities Guide has been one of the most well-regarded by Australian marketeers, because “it comes from Asia and is trusted by Asians” (personal communication, Director of Marketing, Go8 University). Run by Asiaweek, a magazine from AOL Time Warner Inc’s empire of print and electronic media, this process of ‘benchmarking by media’ is also used by Australian universities as a marketing tool. Typically, a university receiving a favourable rating from Asiaweek, will feature its rating on its webpages or in promotional brochures destined for the overseas market. Asiaweek claimed that its objective is “to help Asia’s schools celebrate their strengths and correct their weaknesses”. Curiously, in this discursive domain, the inclusion of Australia as part of Asia is unproblematic. The magazine’s practice of publishing the list of universities who declined to participate in its surveys can be reasonably regarded as a disciplining mechanism. Asiaweek constructs itself to be an expert and positions its survey as an accountability mechanism. It observed sagely that, “universities need an outsider to celebrate their strengths – and point out their weaknesses”. However, in a recent change of heart, the magazine has declared that it will no longer be surveying Asia’s
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7. The Group of Eight Universities in the Australian context refer to the research intensive universities. They include: Universities of Sydney, New South Wales, Queensland, Monash, Melbourne, Adelaide, Western Australia and the Australian National University.

universities. Its website carried this message: “We feel we have done our bit in honouring excellence and pointing out areas of improvement”. The magazine stressed, “we would now like to leave the schools to get on with their development”.

The well publicized Australian University of the Year competition, together with the league tables instituted by ‘quality’ broadsheet British newspapers such as The Times Good Universities Guide, The Guardian University Guide and The Independent A-Z of Universities, are other examples of governing technologies which utilize systems of expertise, calculation and comparison (see Berry, 1999). The impact of these technologies of government will be re-visited in detail in Chapter Four.

Increasingly, technologies of government within the higher education sector utilise and construct expert systems that purport to embody neutrality, authority and skill. In the domain of international education, educational brokers such as Australia’s International Development Programme (IDP) and the British Council’s Education Counselling Service (ECS) are increasingly being cast in the role of experts. Through the inauguration of yearly conferences and the commissioning of selective studies, they are able to establish and stabilise their networks of power. Here, I offer one example of an IDP publication titled, Securing Australia’s Future: An Analysis of the International Education Markets in India. The production and sale of publications like this one secures IDP’s reputation as a market savvy instrumentality that is committed to the national interest and can be counted on by educational marketers, policy advisors, market analysts and universities. Although it operates along the lines of a private sector corporation, IDP has discursively constructed itself as a custodian of national interest and an authority on international education. By contrast, IDP constructs itself as a trustworthy source of ‘impartial advice’ to prospective international students.

To summarise this discussion on the symbiotic links between power and knowledge, Foucault’s work has identified a “dual subjection” in the production, circulation and transmission of discourse. His work, together with the work of governmentality theorists has been important in identifying the conjoint relations between power and knowledge. Thus, a complex assemblage of ‘know how’ including a proliferation of apparatuses, bodies of knowledge, strategies and techniques are put to work to govern what can be said, written and transmitted. Speakers, writers and academics are subject to discourse. At the same time, discourse is subject to ‘rules’ which shape disciplines, monitor and regulate their boundaries, ejecting any interlopers that might pollute the ‘purity’ of their conceptual and theoretical arsenals. These rules present barriers to inter-disciplinary work.

To this list of subjections aimed implicitly at discouraging inter-disciplinary work, we can add the spatio-temporal fixity of many disciplines which privilege first world spaces and often ignore historical contingencies and power geometries (Massey, 1999, pp.28-29). By default then, this type of disciplinary and spatio-temporal fixity, is at risk of silently reproducing a colonial canon (see Tikly, 1999, 2001). Finally, the slippery ladder of professional advancement is increasingly influenced by ‘calculative technologies’, imposed by managerial modes of
accountability. Accordingly, particular types of academic outputs receive greater recognition than others, (for example, publishing in high status refereed journals, earning consultancy income). These factors all play a significant part in steering individual researchers and academics towards particular professional activities (Ball, 2000; Broadhead and Howard, 1998; Marginson and Considine, 2000; Marginson and Mollis, 2001; Ozga, 1998; Rhoades, 1998; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Vidovich and Currie, 1998; Vidovich and Slee, 2001). However, and importantly, the power relations which underpin discourses are not ‘fixed’ in time or across spaces, places, cultures, institutions and practices. They can be modified and re-inscribed to suit social and institutional needs. They can be unsettled from the capillaries.

Having discussed Foucault’s theorisations on power, discourse and governing, I now describe Foucault’s archaeological method, which is the analytical tool used in this thesis to deconstruct the promotional discourses used by international education markets. An archaeological reading reveals how power and knowledge come together in the formation of discourses.

2.5.3 Archaeological Method

A good starting point in analysing discourse is to pose the classic Foucauldian question: given the multiple possibilities of what can be written or said at any particular time, how is it possible that particular utterances are made? Foucault attempts to answer this question through the archaeological method, a set of rules, which govern the formation, functions, dissemination and transformation of discourses.

Archaeology is distinct from critical analysis in that it is not concerned with interpreting silently intended or hidden meanings (Foucault, 1969). Rather, archaeology is premised on the principle of exteriority. Foucault explains this to mean that, “discourses are transparent, they need no interpretation…no one to assign them a meaning” (Foucault, 1988b, p. 115). According to Deleuze (1988), there are two tasks of archaeology: first, to open up words, phrases, propositions and to extract from them, the statements corresponding to each stratum. Second, to uncover the thresholds that statements cross so as to move beyond the status of ‘self-evidence’ unique to each stratum (p. 53). For Foucault, everything is always said in every age but the sayings become occluded often by virtue of being habitual and commonplace. Deleuze’s translation of exteriority is noteworthy, “We need only know how to read...Statements are not hidden but they are not directly readable” (p. 54).

Thus, archaeology is unconcerned with probing authorial intent, in uncovering the consciousness of speaking subjects (Foucault, 1991b, p. 59). Rather, the emphasis is on extracting the rules which first, influence ‘the limits and forms of what is sayable’, what it is possible to speak of. Second, those rules which establish ‘the limits and forms of conservation’. In other words, which utterances are “destined to enter human memory, ritual, pedagogy, publicity, circulation” (Foucault, 1971, pp. 12-13). Here, the emphasis is also on which utterances disappear, which re-appear, how these are put to work, circulated, to what ends
and by which groups. Archaeology identifies which statements are repressed and censored and by which authorities. Third, it establishes the “limits and forms of memory” as they appear in different discursive formations, by differentiating between statements which are valid, invalid or foreign, which have been abandoned and which have been excluded as foreign. It also inquires into the types of relationship between past and present ensembles of statements (discursive formations). Fourth, archaeology examines how discourses of “past epochs” are reactivated. Finally, there are rules that shape or limit the appropriations of discourses including the roles of myriad constituencies (Foucault, 1991b, pp. 59-60).

The archaeological method also highlights the need to attend to discontinuities, to challenge the self-evident (problematization), so as to “rediscov[er] the connections, encounters, supports, blockages, plays of forces, strategies and so on which at a given moment establish what subsequently counts as being self-evident universal and necessary” (Foucault, 1991, p. 76). By using archaeology, the cumulative and evolutionary logic associated with, for example, modernisation, globalisation, the knowledge-based economy or the ‘aid to trade to internationalisation’ teleology is challengeable (see Foucault, 1984, pp. 53-58; Foucault, 1982, pp. 53-54).

For the purposes of this thesis, I have undertaken a selective utilization of archaeological concepts. I have focused on using the following: the ‘rules of formation’, ‘statements’, and ‘enunciative modalities’. These concepts are now explained.

**Rules of Formation**

How does something become an object of discourse? Foucault proposes three rules which are associated with the formation of objects in a discursive formation: the surfaces of emergence, the authorities of delimitation and grids of specification. Surfaces of emergence refer to the social and cultural domains in which an utterance is made (Foucault, 1972, p. 41). Foucault acknowledges that surfaces of emergence will differ across and within societies, spatialities and temporalities. Importantly, surfaces of emergence will differ in the case of different forms of discourse (ibid). For example, in the case of international education, the surfaces of emergence could be state policies concerned with foreign relations and aid to the underdeveloped world. In an economic discourse, the surfaces of emergence of ‘internationalisation’ could be state policies designed to maximise institutional self-sufficiency and enterpreneurialism. Or the international student may emerge as an object of discourse in the context of the problems facing higher education such as declining academic standards, resource constraints and market-like rationalities. Thus, the learning support that they need could see their construction on the one hand as ‘burdens’, and on the other hand as ‘oppressors’ who by virtue of their position as customers make excessive demands on academic staff.

Authorities of delimitation, another of the rules of formation, refer to those authorities which are recognised either by professional association, a formal credential, the possession of a body of knowledge or a history of practice and experience. Thus, they have a concomitant ‘right’ to
name, define or delimit a particular object (Foucault, 1972, pp. 41-42). Not everyone can speak and not with the same authority. Authorities of delimitation are identifiable as speakers and writers who have a legitimate, institutionally sanctioned authority. They may include bureaucrats, academics, business professionals, media magnates and politicians, to name a few. In this study, I will argue that the ways in which the objects of ‘overseas students’ and ‘international education’ have been discussed and categorized and subsequently legitimised is largely because of their authorities of delimitation. Some authorities of delimitation have designated international education as a ‘business’ and international students as ‘customers’. Other authorities of delimitation have designated international education as part of discourse of crass commercialisation which manifests in the institutional ‘selling of degrees’ in order to alleviate their financial problems.

Finally, grids of specification refer to the systems against which an object is “divided, contrasted, related, regrouped” (Foucault, 1972, p. 42). Thus, an object of discourse like the learning needs of international students, can be classified or measured against a variety of systems – language deficits (e.g., poor English language proficiency), learning strategy deficit (e.g., surface and rote learning) or cultural deficits (the influence of ‘Asian’ ontology and epistemology).

These three rules of formation do not provide fully formed objects, rather they interact with each other in complex ways to develop the conditions of possibility of what can be said, written and transmitted into discourse (Sheridan, 1980, p. 98). Exactly how these rules interact to produce objects of discourse, is not clear. This has been a valid criticism of the archaeological method: it is obscure in specifying the process from emergence of an object, to its epistemologization as discourse. Although he is less explicit in his archaeological work about the relations between discursive and non-discursive forces in producing discourse, Foucault’s references to the surfaces of emergence and authorities of delimitations nonetheless, are an acknowledgement of the role played by social practices and power relations in the formation of discourse (McNay, 1994, p. 72). It is in his later work on genealogy and governmentality that he openly acknowledges the importance of both factors in shaping discourse.

**Statements**

Foucault describes discourse in terms of its statements. At its simplest, the statement (*enounce*) is “the atom of discourse” (Foucault, 1972, p. 80), and as such, is the building block of knowledge (Deleuze, 1988, p. 49). Foucault goes to some lengths to detail what a statement is.

---

9. Some of these criticisms were subsequently addressed through Foucault’s genealogical work. Foucault describes genealogy as...“a historical knowledge of struggles”; a “union of erudite knowledge and local memories” (Foucault, 1980b, p. 83). In other words, genealogy involves tracing the paths of history to identify the emergence of particular knowledges including their ‘interactions’ with, and resistances against other knowledges.
not. It is not a sentence, proposition or utterance. It is a function with several constitutive elements, according to Foucault (1972, p. 115):

In examining the statement what we have discovered is a function that has a bearing on groups of signs, which is identified neither with grammatical “acceptability” nor with logical correctness, and which requires if it is to operate: a referential (which is not exactly a fact, a state of things, or even an object, but a principal of differentiation); a subject (not the speaking consciousness, not the author of the formulation, but a position that my be filled in certain conditions by various individuals); an associated field (which is not the real context of the formulation, the situation in which it was articulated, but a domain of co-existence for other statements); a materiality (which is not the only substance or support of the articulation but a status, rules of transcription, possibilities of use and re-use (my emphasis).

The subject in discourse should not, however, be confused with the author of a proposition or a text, “the subject is not the cause, origin or starting point of the phenomenon of the written or spoken articulation of a sentence...” (ibid, p. 95). Rather, the subject is “a vacant place that may in fact be filled by different individuals...[it is a] place which varies...” (ibid). Importantly, in his later work Foucault argues that the subject should not be seen as ‘outside’ of discourse, that the idea of an “all powerful subject who manipulates discourse, overturns them, renews them”, needs to be refined. The subject occupies a place within discourse and has a function. Discourse thus, needs to be thought of as “a space of differentiated subject-positions and subject-functions” (Foucault, 1991b, p. 58).

Archaeology does not clarify how and why individuals occupy particular subject positions in different situations and at different times, although Foucault tries to resolve this issue in his later work on governmentality when he argues that it is by appealing to the rationality of citizens and by engaging with their desires and aspirations that individuals can be persuaded to occupy particular subject positions. In other words, using particular rationalities, individuals are persuaded to develop a ‘will to desire’ and will accordingly apply particular practices of self-government and in doing so, occupy particular subject positions.

Significantly, Foucault sees statements as exhibiting a rarity. He suggests that at any one time, there are a relative paucity of statements that appear, despite the infinite number of possible things that can be said, Again, Foucault is vague about the reasons for this rarefaction of discourse in his writings on archaeology. A more detailed explication of the conditions that produce the rarity of discourse is outlined in his subsequent work, Orders of Discourse (Foucault, 1971) where he acknowledges the complex rules, both external and internal which govern the production, transmission, communication and formalisation of discourse.

Enunciative Modality

By enunciative modality, Foucault means the rules which operate to shape the conditions for statements to bind together and form discursive formations (Foucault, 1972, p. 50).
Enunciative modalities concern the status of the speaker, the sites from which statements are made and the position of the subjects of discourse (pp. 50-52). The status of the speaker is pivotal to the ‘value and efficacy’ accorded to the statement. Speakers may derive their status from a qualification or a statutory authority. Also of importance are the institutional sites from which the statements emerge and derive their legitimacy. A statement can have a different meaning and a different impact depending on the site from which it is uttered. However, the importance or authority of institutional sites are not fixed. For example, up until a decade ago in Australia, the authority of bodies such as the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee (AVCC) appeared unquestionable. Then, it was unusual for business leaders to comment on higher education. However, there has been something of a reversal of authority in recent times and the commentary of business leaders in matters of education is now considered important while the AVCC’s opinions have less gravitas.

2.5.4 Limitations of Using Foucault’s Archaeology

Many of the criticisms of Foucault’s earlier work were resolved in his later work. However, those who have restricted their readings to his earlier work have voiced a number of criticisms which I now discuss. Feminist theorists represent some of Foucault’s strongest critics. They have accused him of ignoring extra-discursive forces such as patriarchy, racism and socio-economic disadvantage, all of which have profound consequences for individuals and communities. I noted earlier that Foucault’s references to “the play of dependencies between the intradiscursive, interdiscursive and extradiscursive” suggests his awareness of the role played by macro-contextual forces in producing and transforming discourse (Foucault 1991b, p. 58). However, Cain (1993) argues that Foucault’s work represents an inadequate engagement with extra-discursive forces. For Cain, the problem lies in Foucault’s preoccupation with the purely internal relations of discourse, for example, the relations between objects, concepts, strategies, statements and discursive formations.

Another area of criticism by feminist theorists, concerns the capillary workings of power, which they argue, subvert attempts to resist power and oppression (Grimshaw, 1993, pp. 53-55, 60). Foucault’s radical anti-essentialism has also been held responsible for subverting any potential for emancipatory politics (Soper, 1993, pp. 33-34). Foucault fails to recognise the importance of collective goals and aspirations, which have been the cornerstone of feminist activism. He is accused of not providing any ethical guidelines for normative action either and this has led to criticisms of nihilism (see Walzer, 1986; Smart, 1986). However, a close reading of his work including the interviews he provided, suggests that Foucault was not dismissing collective action in preference to individualised activism. Rather, he was pointing to the limitations of using a singular normative model to inform social action. Thus, in keeping with his maxim that ‘liberty is a practice’, he endorsed situated, specific action and defined activism.

A related criticism has been his insistence on writing about the ‘truth effects’ produced within discourses, rather than conceptualising discourses as ideologies (Foucault, 1984b, pp. 56-60;
Foucault, 1980, p. 133). For Foucault, the political question is not one of ideology, but of the construction of truths. Theorists like Hall (1988) and Hennessy (1993), argue that Foucault’s abolition of the category of ideology, makes it difficult to acknowledge the systematic operation of social totalities such as patriarchy, capitalism and racism. While Hall (1988) acknowledges that there is ‘no necessary correspondence’ between specific ideologies and the production of particular social and institutional outcomes, nonetheless, he notes with some concern, the extremes to which theorists go to emphasise ‘necessary non-correspondence’ (p. 52) in their bids to insulate themselves from essentialist logic. At the same time, both Hall (1988, p. 51) and Dean (1994, p. 17) acknowledge that Foucault’s archaeological method makes significant strides in recognising, in Dean’s words, the ‘being’ of discourse, its location in time and place, its materiality, and the conditions that lead to its existence, including extra-discursive forces and processes.

Archaeology’s preoccupation with formalist rules is also held responsible for conveying the notion of discourse as an ensemble of subject-less practices (see Pecheux, 1988). McNay (1994, p. 49) for example, argues that archaeology’s formal style of analysis doesn’t acknowledge the social embeddedness of discourse, that is that discourse is a culturally specific phenomenon. Nor does it clarify how subjects come to occupy discursively constructed subject positions, how these positions change over time, and in different situations. On the other hand, it is archaeology’s rule-governed character, which demonstrates that discourse cannot be reduced to a subjective reading by an individual (Dean, 1994, pp.16-17).

Other critics have noted that the minimal space given to discussions of the subject effectively ignores the subject’s potential for resistance. While acknowledging Foucault’s emphasis on the productivity of power as largely positive, Said (1986) describes Foucault’s imagination as “…largely with power rather than against it” (p. 152). He observes that Foucault is silent on such matters as “what you would need to vanquish present power and install a new order or power” [and] “how to postulate…things that cannot be imagined or commanded by existing forms of power” (p. 151). For Said, this translates into a lack of interest and by extension, optimism about the prospects for resistance. Indeed, it was through his attempt to answer some of these criticisms, that Foucault was led to develop the concept of governmentality where his writings on the technologies of the self expanded to include the multiplicity of subject positions, and the potential for reflexivity and resistance.

It is generally agreed that some of these problems, including the importance of extra-discursive forces in producing discourse, are resolved in Foucault’s later work on governmentality, in particular on the technologies of the self, where Foucault explores the issues of how individuals occupy particular subject positions within discourse ahead of others. For this reason, I have taken a theoretical and methodological approach which uses governmentality as an analytic to understand power relations from their microphysical to their macrocontextual manifestations, while using archaeology to deconstruct promotional materials used in international education markets.
2.6 The Multiple Subject

In drawing together his theorisations on the human subject, Foucault’s work can be said to unsettle notions of an authentic, unitary subject. While western philosophy conceptualised the self as having an ‘essence’, Foucault’s work showed that the subject is a product of historical developments shaped by official knowledges and institutionalised practices. Thus, his work problematises the long-held liberal notion that ‘knowledge is power’ (Gordon, 1980, pp. 233-234).

In his earlier works, which includes Archaeology of Knowledge, Foucault understands the subject to be largely ‘scripted’ by social forces such as institutions and discursive formations (disciplinary knowledges). As discussed earlier, he has been criticised for taking a deterministic perspective of the subject. However, as I elaborated in a previous section, Foucault’s later work on technologies of the self outlined ways in which subjects could negotiate and ‘craft’ their identities, and engage in practices of freedom (Mansfield, 2000, pp. 54-59).

It is clear from Foucault’s work, and the substantial work of various governmentality theorists, that there is no essential human subject. To impose a singular reading on the subject is an act of power, and is dangerous. While some have criticised Foucault for his scepticism and nihilism, his view of the subject as both object and vehicle of power, as historically constituted and thus, shifting, prompts greater self-scrutiny and greater accountability. In place of declarations of an autonomous and authentic subject, Foucault’s position would be to demand how the subject practices autonomy and authenticity.

So far, this chapter has examined Foucault’s work on the ways in which power, knowledge and government work to shape the human subject. The concept of governmentality provides a theoretical map with which to understand how the aspirations of government are connected to the actions of organisations, and the ambitions, desires and beliefs of human subjects. Archaeology, on the other hand, provides a set of tools to identify how discourses emerge and function to produce particular understandings and knowledges.

Having provided a detailed description of how Foucault’s work can be applied to this study, I now discuss the discursive field of education to reveal some of the ‘truths’ surrounding international education and the international student in both pre-marketised and marketised eras of international education. However, a delimitation before proceeding further: It is not within the scope of this study to provide an exhaustive description of all the statements about the learning of international students. Thus, the statements that are discussed in the next section are not by any measure representative of all that has been said about international students. Rather, it is an example of some of utterances that key authorities have made.

2.7 ‘Truths’ & Theory: International Student Learning

One of the most cited work in discussions about international students in Australia is Study Abroad: A Manual for Asian Students (Ballard and Clancy, 1984). Study Abroad is targetted at the
the individual student from Asia who is planning to or who has already embarked on a study abroad sojourn. To this end, *Study Abroad*, describes itself as offering prospective and actual students assistance in developing skills in critical learning. It is also directed at teachers of international students and as I discuss later, has been elevated to the position of an authoritative text by the practices of citation.

Throughout the book the authors make explicit their view that cultural variations exist in thinking and learning. They suggest that Asian students are likely to bring an uncritical and reproductive approach to learning compared to western students. Conserving knowledge means rote learning and the uncritical acceptance of written texts and teachers’ authority. A different attitude to knowledge, authority and learning is held responsible for a disjunction between the goals of an Australian university education and the education expectations of the overseas students. Ballard’s (1987) paper, *Academic Adjustment: The Other Side of The Export Dollar*, and her two books co-authored with Clancy, *Study Abroad* (1984) and *Teaching International Students* (1997), construct an Asian subjectivity which is passive, dependent and uncritical in learning. Through the practices of citation, this deficit subjectivity as constituted in these texts has assumed significance, perhaps even dominance among some academics. I will briefly discuss some of the objects that both authors have sought to place under their academic gaze including the statements that appear in their writings and how these construct particular subject positions for the Asian student. I argue that these statements are resonant with an earlier imperialising ethos.

Ballard’s (1987) paper titled, *Academic Adjustment: The Other Side of the Export Dollar* makes much of an ‘Asian culture’ where the authority of the teacher means that students have little curiosity and will follow their explanations unquestioningly. She draws comparisons between a monochromatic Western and an equally singular and essentialised Asian culture. “In Western education...the ideal model of the teacher is Socrates, and the Socratic method the ideal teaching style”. By contrast, “...in Asia, knowledge is not open to challenge and extension...the Zen master is no argumentative Socrates...Questioning analysis, criticism are not part of the learning process, nor are they allowed for in the teaching style” (p. 114).

While acknowledging that developing countries face significant material and economic problems, Ballard is firm that the cause of the problem is “these cultural attitudes to the process of teaching and learning” (ibid, pp. 113-114). Quoting from a 1960 text which describes the relations between teacher and student in a Burmese village school, Ballard discusses the “reciprocal expectations and obligations” between teachers and their students in Asian culture:

> If the student has worked diligently, learned thoroughly the materials presented in class, and followed the teacher’s explanations unquestioningly, then that student has the right to expect to pass. If the student fails, it must be the fault of the teacher who in some way has misled the students and not provided clearly and adequately, the correct material and the correct ways of answering the questions. At postgraduate level
overseas students may see the responsibility of their supervisors in much the same light. Such a view, however, may not be shared by the Australian teacher. In fact, even the small courtesies offered by overseas students to their teacher – small presents, politeness, unfailing smiles and assurances that everything is going well...may be misread as ‘crawling’, ‘bribery’ or ‘blackmail’ by an insular and democratic Australian lecturer (ibid, pp. 113-114).

Two statements can be isolated from this paragraph. First, that cultural expectations held by Asian students of their teachers absolves them of accepting responsibility for their academic performance. The attributes we expect this Asian learner to have are passivity, dependence, and irresponsibility. The subjectivity conveyed by this statement is a child-like and intellectually inferior native. Second, references to alien ‘courtesies’ are suggestive of a set of sinister motives by a subject who is dishonest, greedy and rapacious. The “insular and democratic Australian lecturer” has few options but to “misread” these courtesies as “bribery”, “crawling” or “blackmail” (ibid). Both statements reflect a discursive continuity with colonial ideologies and function to position the other not only as intellectually inferior but also duplicitous.

Elsewhere, the paper refers to “long suffering supervisors”, noting that “most teachers, no matter how well disposed they feel towards overseas students resent spending time...editing the English of written assignments and coping with inarticulate tutorial participants” (p. 116). Here, the subject position accorded to the overseas student is as an ‘oppressor’ who causes suffering and dissipates the goodwill of teachers, by virtue of having poor English language and academic skills. Ballard fails to reflect on or to challenge the hegemony of the English language.

While providing some useful suggestions for institutional changes including ways to support both academic staff and international students, Ballard’s (1984) text, nevertheless reproduces a discursive logic that is anchored in the classic colonial discourse. Premised on ‘othering’ and simple essentialisations between ‘Asian’ and ‘Western’, she offers few insights of the multiplicities contained within these very categories.

Teaching International Students: A Brief Guide for Learners and Supervisors, the latest publication by Ballard and Clancy (1997), has a less strident tone. However, the old truisms have re-emerged. As with their earlier work, a binary is constructed between the Western and Asian ‘attitudes to knowledge’. Asian cultures have a conserving orientation, while Western educational traditions are premised on an extending approach to knowledge. Thus, a reproductive style which is associated with Asian learners is also identified with primary school education in the West. A discursive link between the Asian attitude to knowledge and that of primary school children is almost inevitable. How has this discourse remained so resilient given the progressive impulses of internationalisation? What does its dissemination tell us about power/knowledge relations in international education? These are some of the inquiries that I pursue in this study.
Samuelowicz’s (1987) study of teachers of international students takes a similar approach and arrives at similar conclusions as Ballard (1987) and Ballard and Clancy (1984; 1997). Like Ballard and Clancy, she collapses the highly differentiated mass of cultures, languages and intellectual traditions into a single homogeneous category of ‘Asian’. Bradley and Bradley’s (1984) study on a single national group of students, Indonesian postgraduates in receipt of Australian government scholarships, also identified particular learning ‘deficits’. However, their study attributed differences in learning styles between Indonesian and Australian postgraduates to different educational systems in both countries instead of cultural differences. In other words, at about the same time as Ballard and Clancy were using a culturally essentialist text to construct a passive ‘Asian’ subjectivity, Bradley and Bradley had problematised the situational context. Yet, it has been Ballard and Clancy’s work that has assumed the status of ‘dominant discourse’ while the Bradleys’ work has been relegated to ‘subjugated’ status.

Overall, many of these studies share similarities in that they operate on essentialisms and binary thinking. The role of other variables of the educational environment such as language difficulties, different pedagogies and methods of assessment between home and provider countries is acknowledged but the overall preoccupation is with proving that there are more deep-seated issues at the foundation of Asian students’ learning difficulties, namely cultural differences in attitudes to knowledge, learning and teaching. The effects of this discursive practice is to resurrect a colonial discourse. Researcher introspection is patently missing and the small sample size of students studied casts further doubt on the generalisability of this research. The ‘common sense’ constructed by specific intellectuals, in this case higher education academics in the 1980s, saw the prevalence of certain regimes of truth about the abilities of international students. Asian students were discursively constructed to be passive, uncritical and superficial learners. As my review of the literature has revealed, a raft of statements were produced as part of the discourse on the Asian learner which had an intertextual resonance with the civilizing imperatives of colonial modernity. The function of these statements is to legitimate a view of an underdeveloped world seeking tutelage from the developed Western world. I will argue in the course of this study, using promotional narratives, that traces of this discourse remain within the international university.

By the 1990s, studies into the learning approaches of international students were assuming greater sophistication. Biggs and Watkins (1996), Volet and Renshaw (1995), Volet, Renshaw and Tietzel (1994) and Niles (1995) challenged the stereotype of the passive, surface-learning ‘Asian’ student. All of these studies addressed the teaching context’s impact on learning behaviours. Their findings were similar and concluded that students’ perceptions of course requirements had a greater influence on their learning than their cultural background. Surface learning was found amongst both Australian and international students in certain situations. These findings also highlighted the importance of undertaking longitudinal studies. Pearson and Beasley’s (1997) four year long longitudinal study trialled an integrative learning paradigm which found that the creation of ‘safe’ contexts where students were encouraged to
take greater personal responsibility without experiencing personal humiliation significantly improved their ability to engage in deep learning. A cluster of studies also sought to problematise the institutional context (see Keech, 1996; Morris and Hudson, 1995; Nines, 1999).

Keech’s (1996) study examined the discursive practices of providing feedback to written assignments by academic staff. She found that the object of their commentary largely concentrated on the mechanics of English language expression used by international students. In Keech’s study the ‘passive and uncritical Asian learners’ that predominated in the discursive logic of Ballard (1987, 1994), Ballard and Clancy (1984; 1997) and Samuelowicz (1987), expressed frustration and resistance to feedback practices which were preoccupied with grammar, spelling, punctuation while ignoring the arguments, supporting evidence, structure and style presented in their essays (Keech, 1996, p. 7). Keech concluded her paper with a provocative thesis: that in response to calls to pedagogically acknowledge difference in the classroom, a counter-discourse had emerged from the academic community which was intent on declaring a literacy crisis in the marketised university (pp. 11-12).

Nines (1999) study into the academic acculturation of a group of Indian postgraduate students enrolled in the Master of Business Administration (MBA) programme, is illustrative of the ‘new’ statements emerging at the end of the 1990s to describe international education. Using Foucault’s theorisations on the disciplining power of knowledge, Nines examines the institutional use of disciplinary techniques such as normalising judgement, examination and hierarchical observation, and the types of changes in student learning that subsequently arise. His study concluded that Australian universities utilise a variety of technologies to maintain hegemonic knowledge relations, namely, a dominant knowledge system which serves the interests of international business and capitalism. This discursive structure is presumed also to be in the interest of ‘choosing and autonomous customers’ – the international students.

There is little interest in this business text for incorporating other epistemologies. Instead, both ‘official’ influences such as the stated academic requirements of courses, and ‘unofficial’ influences such as the support offered by ‘senior’ international students and the personal attributes of lecturers, work to construct a particular learning, writing and speaking style. Thus students learned that project presentations demanded particular modes of dress and particular styles of speaking. Engaging in ‘appropriate’ communication by “speaking up in tutorials” and “using Powerpoint” presentations was imperative otherwise, “if you don’t ask, you don’t speak, that’s it. Your MBA is gone” (p. 31).

Nines noted that most of the students in his study modified their behaviours to achieve a better ‘fit’ with their lecturers’ expectations so as to achieve the desired results of good marks. In most cases, students expressed their conviction in the merits of the learning styles promoted by the course and by teaching staff. They felt that the course represented training in the real world of international business (p. 37). Resistance was manifest only where there were poor levels of interpersonal synchrony with teaching staff, and where the lecturers’ norms were in
conflict with students’ models of what being a good student entailed. For the greater part, students acquiesced into the course-determined, normative styles of learning and communication, a finding confirmed by Benesch’s (1999) study of academic practices in American universities.

Writing about ways of developing a new academic ethos within Australian universities, Morris and Hudson (1995) argue for a ‘regionally-portable’ and ‘planetary-portable’ education, which they anticipate as offering benefits to both international and Australian graduates. There are compelling reasons for training all students for global citizenship (p. 70). Like Keech (1996) and Nines (1999), they problematize the type of education that is promoted as ‘international’ but is resolutely monocultural and nationalist in focus. Along with Cadman (2000) and Kelly (1998, 2000), these studies share a common discursive logic. They emphasise the need for universities to go beyond inter-culturalism, towards transculturalism where the emphasis is on creating a ‘third culture’ which is different from the original cultures of both international students and the normative culture of universities.

What I have attempted to do in this section is illustrate the types of statements that emerged and were circulated over a period of time, extending from the ‘aid’ phase to present expressions of international education. Although not an exhaustive review of what is visible and sayable about international education, it is useful in mapping the types of subjectivities attributed to the international student. As such, as provides a historical ‘grid’ against which to assess contemporary subjectifications of international students, the focus of much of this thesis.

2.8 Conclusion

This chapter introduced and discussed Foucault’s work as a means of establishing the theoretical and methodological grounding for this study. It introduced Foucault’s theoretical tools which will be used in later chapters to detect, map and examine the plural statements that decide what we know and can say about international education. Subsequent chapters will employ Foucault’s conceptual tools to analyse what is ‘visible and sayable’ about international education at the sites of production and consumption. From this basis, of identifying ‘objects’ of knowledge in public discourses about international education, I will identify regimes of truth about international education, the international university and the international student. I focus on Foucault’s theorisations on knowledge and power, on discourse, subjectivity and government. I show that techniques of discourse, subjectification and government are related to one another.

I conclude this chapter with several key points which are relevant for my study. First, it is the reciprocal relationship between power and knowledge that produces and sustains discourse. A series of rules, all underpinned by power relations, influence the production, accumulation, circulation, functioning and institutionalisation of discourse. Thus, particular socio-cultural and historically situated power/knowledge constellations have attributed to the ‘Asian
student’, the subject position of passive, uncritical learner. Power/knowledge constellations have also been responsible for the institutionalisation of international educational markets and the subjectification of the international student as ‘customer’ and the international university as a knowledge factory.

Second, Foucault’s theorisation of power relations, with their emphasis on both the descending and ascending modalities of power is pivotal in casting light on the processes of subject-formation. Such an analytic of power also has methodological consequences. It requires attending to the role of the state in the formation of subjectivity. With this in mind, I analyse policy discourses in Chapter Four and Chapter Five. On the other hand, an ascending modality of power demands attention to the microphysics of power, that is, the micropractices or mundane and routine details. This is what I do in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine, when I analyse promotional materials, websites and the institutional policies of a group of international universities.

Because globalisation has been discursively associated with the drive to internationalise Australia’s universities, to make them ‘world class’, I will examine globalisation theories for their relevance for understanding international education in the next chapter. However, I will review the vast literature on globalisation in a less conventional way. Taking globalisation theory as a ‘discourse’, my intention is to examine how writings on globalisation construct and/or privilege particular ‘objects’ of knowledge, including normalising particular understandings about the nation-state and social relations, as well as sustaining particular subjectification processes ahead of others. I will apply selective writings and frameworks of globalisation to examine how local and global tensions are negotiated by producer and consumer systems within the network of international education markets.

In the next chapter, I employ an archaeological reading of theoretical discourses of globalisation to identify the objects privileged and those excluded by theorists, the subjectivities presumed and produced, and ways in which power relations shape understandings of the nation-state. Having identified key statements in globalisation discourses, I analyse which of these inform and inspire contemporary assertions of international education.