Aotearoa/ New Zealand education for sale? Aspects of globalisation of our education system[1]

SMITH, Richard

Te Kura Mātauranga School of Education, AUT University, Auckland, New Zealand

Abstract: This paper overviews aspects of Aotearoa/New Zealand education policy in relation to globalisation and internationalisation drawing upon recent literature in this field. Two policies in particular are highlighted the increasing internationalisation through 'export education' policies and the imposition of the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) as a research auditing regime designed to redistribute tertiary funding and make the higher education sector both more accountable and economically and internationally competitive. In this paper I draw upon an eclectic range of data and sources including some of my own and other recent research in this area.

Keywords: Globalisation, internationalisation, commodification/ marketisation of education

Introduction

This paper outlines facets of Aotearoa/New Zealand education policy in relation to globalisation and internationalisation drawing upon recent literature in this field. Two policies in particular are showcased as examples of the increasing internationalisation through 'export education' policies and the imposition of the Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) as a research auditing regime designed to redistribute tertiary funding. Furthermore, the PBRF creates the situation whereby the higher education sector is made both more accountable and economically and internationally competitive. In this paper I draw upon an eclectic range of data and sources including some of my own and other recent research in this area.

This document is more of an exploratory study of this field, rather than a fully conceptualised academic article in its current form. It seeks to contextualise some of my own recent research in this domain within those of other Aotearoa/New Zealand academics writing in this field. It should be noted at the outset however, it is somewhat difficult to write about a wide concept such as globalisation without reference to other countries than our own.

This paper comprises four brief sections. I firstly briefly note one aspect of the education policy literature in higher education to outline the impact of globalisation in the Anglo-phone countries to provide a context and a platform to discuss the other two sections. The first major section outlines educational policy literature from principally Australia and New Zealand on internationalisation through export education policies. Then in the second section I mount an argument that the PBRF research auditing regime represents something of at least in a Western-sense the commodification and globalisation of education policy transfer. The third and final section provides a little more data on the nature of educational policy transfer and borrowing. However, this is not a fully conceptualised paper, and primary reason for this being the size limitations in terms of word length therefore I have only drawn upon a limited range of articles here, yet have a much wider pool of literature from a number of countries

---

[1] This paper addresses *some* issues of the major theme of this conference '*Educational research, policy, and practice in an era of globalization: The Asia Pacific perspectives and beyond*'. In particular, it spans the themes of: (i) Education reform and national development; (ii) Expansion and restructuring of higher education; (iii) Management of reforms in school education; and (iv) Marketization and privatization in education.

which is not presented here. The longer term plan is to redevelop this initial paper into a more substantial piece in the future.

Higher Education (HE): The international context of globalisation

Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng (2003, p. 90) argue that following the second world war (in the second half of the twentieth century) witnessed the development and growth of a global market in international education. They note the flow of international students undertaking courses at all levels grew rapidly as developing countries sought to educate their populations. By the centuries end, there were 1.5 million students studying internationally at the HE level. Driving the market expansion was a combination of forces that both pushed the students from their countries of origin and simultaneously pulled them toward certain host nations. By the 1990s, the HE systems of many host nations (e.g. Australia, Canada, the USA, the UK and New Zealand) had become more market focused and institutions were adopting professional marketing strategies to recruit students into fee-paying programmes. For many educational institutions such fees became a critical source of financing.

Part one: The export education phenomena in Australasia

As I have argued elsewhere (Smith, 2003; Smith, 2004a) Australia adopted internationalisation earlier than Aotearoa/New Zealand, however, the Australian focus was mostly at the higher/tertiary education sector, whilst in this country it was more so in the compulsory sector (as well as in tertiary).

Literature from the Australian scene

Pratt and Poole (1999, P 533) argue that the impact of globalisation on Australian universities is profound and that university leaders invoke the rhetoric of globalisation to set the foundations for institutional change, to pursue the repositioning of their institutions, and to develop a new discourse for the sector. Furthermore, these authors suggest that the language of Australian academic leaders is increasingly peppered with such terms and 'globalisation' and' internationalisation'. Supporting Pratt and Poole's research, Turpin, Ireland and Crinnion (2002, P. 327) contend that institutions of higher education in Australia are coming under ever increasing pressure to internationalise their course and programmes. They conclude that this process of globalisation is contributing to uneven economic and educational development.

Providing a critical dimension to internationalisation, Devos (2003: 155) states there has been sustained public debate in Australia since 2001 about the issues of academic standards in relation to the internationalisation of higher education. This debate gave expression to the growing disaffection amongst Australian academics with the pressures for increased commercialisation and entrepreneurialism in their work.

Merias (2004, p. 371) suggests that the second wave of international education in Australia occurred after the introduction of the Overseas Student Policy in 1985. It was motivated by economic and political rationales and its success has been strongly linked to the need of higher education institutions to generate income.

A number of Australian studies have discussed student perspectives on internationalisation such as undergraduate students' perceptions of internationalising the curriculum (Zimitat, 2005; Clifford, 2005); 'positioning' international education and international students by adopting a multiple discourse and discursive practices framework (Koehne, 2004); providing a 'subjectivities' lens in terms of cultural identity (Doherty &

Singh, 2005); emotional social factors contributing to international students' success in university education (Ingleton & Cadman, 2000). In a recent interesting study drawing on Foucaldian notions of power and subjectivity to uncover the discourses which international students speak about themselves and create their identities Koehnne (2006), whereby these students expressed a desire for a reciprocal dialogue with the university and for universities to recognise that many realities and knowledges exist and are valuable.

Yet another source of data has been the impact of marketisation in higher education leading to national and global competition for international students and increasing globalisation (Marginson, 2003). Furthermore, in this publication Marginson provides an excellent overview of the elitist segment of higher education in the USA and Australia (pp. 13-15), international rankings of universities globally (pp. 26-27), the countries which are the principal exporters and importers of tertiary education (pp. 21-24), and the number of international students involved in 'export' education in the Anglophone countries (p. 29) and a host of other information on this topic.

Vidovich (2004, p. 443) drawing on data collected from both the secondary and tertiary sectors argues that both Singapore and Australia have been actively pursuing an agenda to build a unique internationally-oriented curriculum, in a context of globalization, but also within the constraints set by national/State curriculum frameworks, examinations and league tables. She argues the internationalisation aspect fosters a market ideology, which changes power relations.

Most of the research from Australian colleagues is based in the tertiary education sphere, however, Angus (2004) draws his data from experience in the secondary sector with a case study of a school in the state of Victoria (see Angus, 2004).

Literature from Aotearoa/New Zealand
There has been very little published research on the effects of international students on the New Zealand education sphere in either the compulsory or tertiary sectors (see Smith, 2003; 2004a). However, some of available literature includes studies from Butcher (2004) and Lewis (2005). Butcher (2004, p. 255) argues that the convergence of immigration, globalisation and education in New Zealand have had a profound impact particularly in some Auckland schools. Furthermore, Butcher (2003, p. 155) contends that the Labour and National Governments between 1984 and 1999 did not consider international students in policy formation, despite policies during this period ostensibly shifting export education in New Zealand from aid to trade and the increasing number of international students in New Zealand. Thus the period was characterised by an educational environment of competition and withdrawal of state funds from universities and a political and economic environment of neo-liberalism, where international students were absent as people but increasingly present as consumers to market and recruit.
In relation to the Code of Practice (CoP) for International Students, Lewis (2005: 5) states:

> A new Code of Practice enacts multiple technologies of control from quality control to standards setting, benchmarking, certification and audit. Legitimated by a discourse of concern for the pastoral care of school-aged students, it requires institutions to provide detailed information. The Code makes 'the industry' visible, makes a market, controls brand NZ education, regulates through consumer assurances, and imposes direct disciplinary controls on institutions. The Code of Practice makes apparent the ambitions and governmental technologies of the 'augmented' neo-liberal state, and is a

pivotal structure in the constitution of the industry and of the globalising practices that define it.

In relation to the CoP and the recent policy effects on the primary sector I argue that:

In this paper the tertiary and secondary sector are referred to as the more mature, older sister siblings and primary the 'forgotten' little sister. t is argued that the primary and intermediate domain been the Cinderella of the education sector, and because of its relatively small number of international students, and possessing less political clout than its larger older siblings it has been the sector that changes were most easily implemented. Furthermore, because of this lack of significant influence and lack of contestation – the government in early September 2003 made a unilateral strategic decision to change the rules of the game (changing the *Code of Pastoral Care for Pastoral Care International Students*, Ministry of Education, 2003b) for primary schools who had invested hosting international students. This decision by the 'nanny' state was delivered swiftly and with minimal consultation with the educational providers of international educational services, which in some cases has had considerable financial impact upon these schools. t may be claimed it actually undermined some of the central principles of self-management and could be labelled as attempting more centralised control over this important economic area.

The government's decision was prompted by the findings of some research that it had commissioned in 2002 and delivered in July 2003 which raised concerns about the welfare of very young international students (aged 13 and below). However, in spite of the understandable support a position for slightly more regulation, the government imposed its preferred policy position requiring more restrictive conditions for schools enrolling students 13 and under.

(Smith, 2005a)

Codd (2004, p. 21) suggests that:

Public education in New Zealand has become a globally marketable commodity, with the export education' industry becoming a major new area of the national economy. While many schools, both primary and secondary, have become financially dependent on the income derived from foreign fee-paying students, scant attention has been given to educational outcomes of this commercialisation of the public education system.

This finding was also reflected in some of the studies I conducted in this area (Smith, 2003; 2004c; 2005a; 2005b). The second part of the paper on research auditing regimes is now advanced.

Part two: The PBRF and its counterparts in the UK and Australia
As Walker (2005: 6) outlines in the UK context:

The idea of higher education as public good, enriching both the individual and all of society, has arguably been overtaken by a rhetoric of business models and market relations, together with an audit and accounting regulatory culture. Higher education is as a result increasingly regarded as a private commodity rather than a public good.

This situation is occurring throughout the Anglophone countries – and here in this part of the paper the auditing of research in the UK, Australia and Aoteroa/New Zealand is outlined.

The UK

For an overview of what has happened in the UK under the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE, see Smith, 2005c)[2]. In a brief discussion of the RAE Whitty (2006, p. 171) argues that:

> [the RAE] … is a crucial, perhaps even *the* crucial element in shaping the balance of the research that is carried out in universities. If we are to establish a truly mixed economy of research we must get the criteria right. The recent ESRC project in Oxford (Furlong & Onacea, 2005) has contributed to this by suggesting quality criteria that can embrace different research approaches in advance of the next RAE in 2008. Only by having appropriate criteria can we begin to establish the value of different types of education research.

Whitty (2006, p. 172) also suggests that:

> With the current focus of the debate around the 2008 RAE on the need for quality criteria for applied and practice-related research and ways of assessing impact that go beyond citation counts, we should be aware of going to the opposite extreme and disadvantaging research that follows traditional academic models. This would be ceding too much to those who argue that all research, or at least all publicly funded research, should be able to demonstrate utility.

Another useful source of literature is as reflective piece by Armstrong and Goodyear (2006) who argue that research leadership is a complex activity and that its 'assumptions, language and practices are justifiably contested' (2006, p. 19). These authors offer insights into the processes of sense-making having recently migrated to Australia from the UK from educational research leadership position in the UK and assuming similar positions in Australia. They compare the two systems of the RAE and proposed RQF and outline a series of implications of changes in the assessment of research at the national level for leadership research, and at the local faculty and school level. They concluded:

> A flawed approach to research assessment can cause havoc to a field of academic practice – particularly a field like Education which is rarely out of the political limelight. The UK RAE has without doubt created a space within which departments and universities compete with each other vigorously for reputation and contestable funds. But that has not prevented UK HE from analysing, debating and improving the methods used in the RAE. We close by asserting that Australian educational research has much to gain from a better understanding of the UK RAE and from collaborating in the development of a research assessment methodology that can strengthen rather than damage our field. AARE has a key role to play in that process.
>
> (Armstrong & Goodyear, 2006, p. 36)

---

[2] I am aware that Hong Kong also experiences a form of research auditing like the UK's RAE, however, it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss these here. I would be very interested in on-going discussions and perhaps some collaborative on the Hong Kong situation if academics from this country would like to explore these issues further.

These UK authors now based in Australia, advised the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) that the RQF should be a faculty-based assessment exercise (like the UK RAE) rather than one based on the research output of individuals (like the NZ system) of PBRF. Smith and Jesson (2005) also noted that our professional association (NZARE) like their UK counterparts the British Education Research Association (BERA) needed to take a more political stance to influence this educational policy debate. This seems like a useful introduction to the current Australian context.

Furlong and Oancea (2006, p. 91) advance that:

> What is clear is that the forthcoming RAE means that it is now a short term political imperative for the research community in the UK itself to address the issue of quality in applied and practice-based research. A great deal of research activity in the field of education can be characterised as applied and practice-based and if the sector as a whole is to be judged fairly, then there is urgent need for a well informed discussion of quality criteria. But important though such pressure is, it is not the only reason for addressing the issue of quality; equally important is a longer-term debate about what some have called 'a new social contract' for research (Demeritt 2000). … But despite the increased interest in research, there remains concern within the policy and practice communities about apparent lack of accountability of researchers.

The OECD Franscati Manual defines applied research as: 'original investigation undertaken in order to acquire new knowledge …, directed towards a specific practical aim or objective '(OECD 2002a, p. 78, cited in Furlong & Oancea, 2006, p. 92). Furlong and Oancea go on to suggest that applied research is undertaken either to determine possible uses for the findings of basic research or to determine new methods or ways of achieving a specific and predetermined objective.

In relation to 'applied' and 'practitioner' research in Australia according to Groundwater-Smith and Mockler (2006, p. 105) in discussing the reporting features of the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC) exercise, they claim:

> There is an insistence upon publication in the form of scholarly books, book chapters, refereed articles in scholarly journals, and refereed conference publications. However, there is no recognition of articles that might inform practice within a given professional field, and published in journals likely to be read by the profession; let alone reports of practitioner inquiry that may have an ongoing influence upon development and improvement of practice. Little wonder that education academics feel devalued and frustrated by the lack of recognition of the important work that they may engage in when they work with the professional field (Gore and Gitlin 2004, p. 47) even though there may be some universities who internally recognize the value of such enterprises.

> The Higher Education Research Data Collection exercise uses the OECD definition of research which comprises, among other things:

> Creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man (sic), culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications.
>
>   (all cited in Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2006, pp. 105-106)

Whilst it is apparent that in Australian settings the notion of practitioner research is beginning to become more valued, the credibility of this type of research as professional practice under the PBRF definition of 'research' is still being debated in the New Zealand educational context (see Morton & Gordon, 2005; Higgins, 2005; and Haigh, 2005).

Australia

In Australia under the proposed Research Quality Framework (RQF) Yates (2005) points out it is best for the education research community to help develop the criteria against which they will be assessed than have them applied by external bodies. I in previous papers I have also draw upon recent policy work by the AARE Executive in relation to shaping the RQF debate in Australia (Gale, 2005) and written about the proposed new RQF (see Smith, 2005c). Whilst the RQF has not been actualised yet, and the first round proposed for 2006, now extended to 2007 there is much consternation in the Australian academic community about its potential impact. In this regard, as is often the case whilst researching for particular papers, a new book or journal edition comes out with the somewhat 'definitive' view, or in this case comprehensive overview of what is happening in terms of research auditing in the Australian, UK and Aotearoa/New Zealand contexts (see Blackmore, Wright & Harwood, 2006). As Blackmore and Wright (2006) argue in the introductory chapter:

> In 2004, the Prime Minister of Australia announced that the Coalition federal government would be allocating $2.8m to develop Quality Research Accessibility Frameworks during the following eighteen months. Initially intended to be introduced in 2006, the first submission of Research Quality Framework (RQF) portfolios from individual institutions is now set for April 2007. … The RQF itself is expected to have significant effects on not only the status of universities, but also academic careers and work. For education as a filed of research and professional practice, this presents particular challenges. … Australian universities, faculties, disciplinary areas, and academics anticipating the consequences for their futures and rankings in a more differentiated system, have been responding to this new political agenda, despite the lack of specific detail. Responses include ranking journals in a discipline, setting up reward systems for high performing academics, collecting evidence for research portfolios, undertaking mock audits as did the Technology Network of universities, differentiating between staff on the basis of research activity, and benchmarking of individual academics, units and universities against other institutions. At the same time, the educational research community has sought to inform the shape of the model and the measurements of quality and impact to be incorporated into RQF (Blackmore 2005). Already the impact is being felt at this stage on individual faculties, universities and staff. But it is the detail, yet to be confirmed, that will make the greatest
> difference to individual institutions and academics.
>
> (Blackmore & Wright, 2006, p. 1)

Furthermore, Blackmore and Wright (2006, p. 10) argue that:

> Throughout the development of the RQF model there have been common (perhaps predictable) and consistent, apparently non-negotiable characteristics of quality and impact which point to the dominance of the 'science' model. The assessment of education portfolios by a 'social science' panel does provide possibilities for alternatives. However, the requirement that these must be measurable severely limits possibilities for describing the quality and impact of research in education.

The key issues for educational researchers at this point are how, for the purposes of the RQF but also more broadly for the benefit of the field, we might think about what constitutes quality in education research and how we know whether we have made a difference by our research and when that is relevant and when not.

Drawing on recent research from the UK (RAE, 2006, cited in Blackmore & Wright, 2006, p. 10) these authors furthermore contend:

The uniqueness of the field of education is a point well made in the UK Education's sub-panel's proposal for the next round of the RAE in 2008 (RAE 2006). They argue that what counts as quality has to take into account the nature and purpose of educational research as a field. The Education sub-panel argues that research should be judged on three key measures: originality, significance and rigour.

What is interesting in this analysis is that both the UK and New Zealand have separate Education panels, yet Australia under the RQF model has opted for one which comes more broadly under a social science model (something I have previously critiqued, see Smith, 2005c). However, in the NZ context Education has its own panel not a sub-panel like the UK RAE model. Another point of interest is that the Australian educationalists in this volume (well at least Blackmore & Wright, 2006) are advocating for similar measures to the UK model evaluating against originality, significance and rigour which are somewhat different to the PBRF inspired definitions of research quality (see Codd, 2006; Smith & Jesson, 2005; Middleton, 2005).

Yates (2006, p. 131) suggests the following about the proposed RQF:

Developing quality education research in Australia – To some extent, in recent years, AARE and the government have been working on different questions in relation to building quality research in Australia. AARE have been trying to deal with the questions, 'how do we build, support and enhance a quality research culture and one that is appropriate to the field of education?' and 'how do we get more support for education research as field?' DEST and the ARC have been working on the questions, 'How do we sort out better and worse research in Australia? How do we make Australian research more efficient and effective? How do we get better value from it? And How do we better establish its international standing?' We do not have the power to ignore the questions the government is enacting and we need to go on engaging with those questions, but nor should we give up on the questions AARE has rightly been concerned with.

Painting a potentially bleak picture of educational research under the RQF Singh, Han and Harreveld (2006, p. 176) argue that (and I quote at length here):

Not surprisingly, research funding assessment regimes structure but do not absolutely determine their work, culture and organization, let alone its quality or impact. While contract research incites scholars to ask whether they will obtain any material advantage, they also remain committed to using their academic freedom, even within such framework to produce knowledge they find intellectually challenging and rewarding in and of itself. Current managerial efforts to elicit the creativity of education researchers for this enterprise compound their fast-paced work. Over the years it has been turned

into stress-ridden sites of ever-mounting pressures to generate more funding applications, more research higher degree student completions and more publications in refereed journals of international standing. The concern is for a tallying mechanism or scoring system to manage and account for the creativity of education researchers, and to redistribute research funds to those who are considered to count the most according to quantified measures of research quality, impact and esteem.

Bureaucratically ordered research-funding assessments involve the institutionalisation of predictable procedures for eliciting research creativity, and making the productivity, performance and funding of selected education researchers more efficient and cost effective. However, given the recent emergence of the 'knowledge society' as a frame for setting policy agendas, there remains much to be learnt about how to manage creative knowledge workers such as world class education researchers, or even those of international standing. As indicated in the section to follow, efforts to rework Australia's research funding assessment exercise verify this claim (Commonwealth of Australia 2005). This chapter then explores one way of conceiving the relationship between the generative impacts and quality of education research. The focus for the remaking of education research is on forming webs of talent, sustaining openness and advancing the toolkits required for knowledge creation

Given the limited amount of money available from governments for research it is important that publicly beneficial education research be funded. Research funding assessment exercises are of major significance because they determine who receives research money; the prestige of these researchers, their institutions and the status of their field of study; and the future research trajectory of individuals, universities, field of studies, regional communities and the nation-state. The seriousness of any research funding assessment exercise is evident in the consequences it has for both boosting and stifling the socio-economic sustainability, environmental conservation and the multicultural development of regional communities. As in Britain, the research funding assessment exercise it has exported to Australia seeks to measure the research activity of the nation's researchers and their institutions so as to decide how to redistribute the nation's research budget. Some individuals, universities, fields of study and regional communities will be valorised through these privileges others de-valorised (Williams 1998).

Many of the arguments presenting here will be familiar to UK, Hong Kong, and New Zealand colleagues and it is to the situation in Aoteraoa/New Zealand that the paper now reveals.

Research in Aotearoa/New Zealand
There is now being to be a burgeoning literature base of the effects of the PBRF on researcher, particularly in the discipline of Education (see, for example: Ashcroft, 2005; Ashcroft & Nairn, 2005; Davies, Craig & Robertson, 2005; Middleton, 2005; Morris Matthews & Hall, 2006; Roberts, 2006; along with a range of articles in the edited book by Smith & Jesson, 2005)

In a recent paper in which the central research focus and question was on 'Has the PBRF altered the emphasis given to teaching?' Morris Matthews and Hall (2006) reported that in a questionnaire completed by 263 Victoria University of Wellington academic staff that:

Theme 1: the research-teaching balance
Over half of the staff identified the major change in teaching emphasis as a reduction associated with the time or effort put they into different aspects of teaching, such as preparation of lectures, course design, course changes, student advice, fewer assignments, and less marking, less quality feedback to students, and greater encouragement of student responsibility for their own learning. Most of these staff associated the change with efforts to increase research productivity.

(Morris Matthews and Hall, 2006, p. 22)

What will happen to the quality of teaching in TEOs if this process continues?

Codd (2006, pp. 51-53) drawing on a raft of UK literature suggests that (and I quote at length here):

In many ways, the RAE has made major consequences for the shaping of academic identities and careers. For example, a departmental head interviewed in Prichard's (2000) study reported on the pressures experienced by staff in striving to maintain the department's level 5 rating on the RAE. Thus, improving the department's rating became the primary purpose for doing research and publishing and in this way the RAE was shaping academics' self-identities in line with the interests of their managers.

In some discipline areas, the RAE has encouraged a closer relationship between research activity and the needs of commerce and industry. As Willmott (2003: 135) points out, this was an explicit instruction given to panels for the 1996 RAE. He argues that the introduction and operation of RAEs, 'underpinned by a form of 'peer review', has occurred in the context of mounting pressures from the state to reduce the unit costs of higher education products (e.g. knowledge and knowledge workers), while simultaneously making university research more responsive, rhetorically and substantively, to commercial and political agendas' (Willmott, 2003: 129).

It is important to recognise that schemes such the RAE and PBRF are by their very nature highly competitive – they are designed to sustain and enhance a market environment. Because the competition is for a finite quantum of research funding, there is a circularity to the process (Henkel 2000: 130). Departments or institutions that receive more funding are then placed in a stronger position to maintain or improve their relative rating position and hence receive even more funding. An example of this is the evidence that teacher education institutions in Britain struggling to establish a research culture have been further penalised by receiving a low RAE rating (Dadds & Kynch 2003).

Regulation of academic research work was achieved in a number of ways by setting down expectations in terms of quality research outcomes, including highly regarded areas of research, 'types' of publications and award of research funding (Lucas 2004: 44).

As universities have entered the global marketplace, producing measurable outcomes for the knowledge economy, it has been necessary to commodify the research process itself. In the no longer a source of enlightenment, empowerment or critical self-awareness; it is a product, a commodity to be owned and traded, a source of surplus value like all other goods and services. Because the PBRF imposes a regulatory regime

on academic work which emphasises short-term performance at the expense of learned reflection and deliberative contemplation, it will further accelerate the commodification of research and diminish its significance as a creative force at the centre of intellectual life.

Codd's points are similar to those raised through the Smith and Jesson (2005) publication and to many of the themes developed in Smith (2005c).

Part three: To what extent is policy borrowing and transfer occurring?

It seems somewhat evident that there are some element of policy borrowing and transfer occurring here between the UK and New Zealand and also the UK (see Singh, Han & Harreveld, 2006). Furthermore, as Smith, Baston, Bocock and Scott (2002, p. 449) note:

> There is a growing literature, particularly within political science and comparative social policy concerned to describe and analyse the process involved when policies, programmes, institutional and administrative arrangements, developed in one political system are used to influence the development of policy ideas and programmes in another political system (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000: 5). Variously, described as lesson drawing or policy learning, emulation, borrowing or transfer, studies in this literature share a common focus essentially on the decision-making processes by which policies and practices moved between political jurisdictions.

I would contend this is happening increasingly in the field of Education too.

Drawing on other analyses these authors observe:

> In their most recent analysis, Dolowitz and Marsh (2000) emphasize the importance of distinguishing between policy and programme in the transfer process. Policies are seen as the broader statements of intent, or the strategic direction in which policy makers would like policy to take them. Programmes are defined as 'the specific means of the course of action used to implement policies' (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000: 12). The former may include policy goals, policy content and policy instruments. All may be transferred from one jurisdiction to another. It is equally possible to transfer ideas about policy programmes, institutions, ideologies, ideas, attitudes and even negative lessons.
>
> (Smith, Baston, Bocock and Scott, 2002, p. 458)

There have been aspects of both policy and programme transfer happening in particular between the UK and NZ since the education reforms in the late 1980s (see Dale & Ozga, 1993; Gordon & Whitty, 1997; Thrupp, 1998, 2005; and Ozga, 2000). Furthermore, these policy transfers have had significant impacts in shaping mutual policy objectives and in shaping internationalisation and globalisation of education, a point which leads nicely into the conclusion.

Conclusion

In what ways doe this paper addresses the overall conference theme of '*Educational research, policy, and practice in an era of globalization: The Asia Pacific perspectives and beyond*'? It does so in the following multiple ways from my perspective. Firstly, it questions the notions of transferring policy from one country domain to another; and raises moral and ethical issues about globalisation and internationalisation which addresses the central theme

of the conference. Furthermore, secondly it draws upon a host of Australasian literature to highlight the issues of research assessment and auditing in higher education. It also briefly considered some of the data from the UK's RAE. There were also questions raised about the power of the funding mechanisms to promote certain types of research and downplay the effects of others (which addressed the theme of expansion and restructuring og higher education).

Drawing on the role of the academic mandate to act as the 'critic and conscious' for society and using academic freedom to highlight issues I argue in a somewhat 'global' and more specifically Asia-Pacific regional context that 'we' as an educational research community (and APERA as an organisation) need use our collective resources and multiple voices to critique aspects of educational policy. The debate around the potential merits of research assessment exercises needs to occur and some potential collaborative research might result from this with a comparative study of Aotearoa/New Zealand, Hong Kong and Australia context with their similarities and differences. In my own country the marketisation and privatisation in education[3] (particularly in the compulsory schooling sector: in primary and secondary education) has become common-place with schools actively embracing internationalisation strategies. Whilst there are benefits in terms of both fiscal and cultural imperatives alternatively, there are also potentially very negative aspects of globalisation a small country such as Aotearoa/New Zealand might lose its distinctive bicultural educational roots. Is Aotearoa/New Zealand education on, or for sale? The answer to this is increasingly yes aspects of globalisation both seek to widen yet perhaps negatively influence *our* education system. I believe it is up to us as committed members of national associations such the New Zealand Association for Research in Education (NZARE); the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE); and other professional associations associated with APERA to see that national and increasingly regional, international, and globalised educational policies do not go unchallenged as 'unproblematic' in both the literature and our educational; practice.

References

Angus, L. (2004). Globalization and educational change: Bringing about reshaping and renorming of practice. *Journal of Education Policy, 19* (1), 23-41.

Armstrong, D. & Goodyear, P. (2006). Implications of external quality assessment for local research leadership: learning from the UK RAE experience. In J. Blackmore, J. Wright, & V. Harwood, V. (Eds.). *Counterpoints on the quality and impact of educational research: Review of Australian Research in Education*, RARE 6, (pp. 19-41). The Australian Educational Researcher – Special Issue.

Ashcroft, C. (2005). Performance-Based Research Funding: A mechanism to allocate funds or a tool for academic promotion? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 40* (1-2), 113-130.

Ashcroft, C. & Nairn, K. (2004). Critiquing the Tertiary Education Commission's role in New Zealand's tertiary education system: policy, practice and panopticism. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studie*s, *23* (2), 43-55.

Blackmore, J., Wright, J. & Harwood, V. (Eds.). (2006). *Counterpoints on the quality and impact of educational research: Review of Australian Research in Education*, RARE 6, The Australian Educational Researcher – Special Issue.

---

[3] These points address two other themes of this conference: marketization and privatization of education and the management of reforms in school education.

Blackmore, J. & Wright, J. (2006). The quality agenda and some issues for educational research and researchers: an introductory essay. In J. Blackmore, J. Wright, & V. Harwood, V. (Eds.). *Counterpoints on the quality and impact of educational research: Review of Australian Research in Education*, RARE 6, (pp. 1-18). The Australian Educational Researcher – Special Issue.

Butcher, A. (2003). Whither international students? The absence of International Student Policy during New Zealand's university reforms from 1984 to 1999. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 38* (2), 151-162.

Clifford, V. (2005, July). Embracing and resisting border pedagogies: Student views of internationalising the curriculum in higher education. Paper presented at the 'Higher education in a changing word', HERDSA conference, 3-6 July, Sydney.

Codd, J. (2004). Export education and the commercialisation of public education in New Zealand. In I. Livingstone (ed.). *New Zealand Annual Review of Education, 13: 2003* (pp. 21-42). Wellington: School of Education: Victoria University.

Codd, J. (2006). Assessing research quality: the origins and outcomes of new Zealand's performance-based research fund. In J. Blackmore, J. Wright, & V. Harwood, V. (Eds.). *Counterpoints on the quality and impact of educational research: Review of Australian Research in Education*, RARE 6, (pp. 43-55). The Australian Educational Researcher – Special Issue.

Dale, R. & Ozga, J. (1993). Two hemispheres: Both new right? Education reform in New Zealand, England and Wales. In B. Lingard., J. Knight & P. Porter (Eds.). *Schooling reform in hard times* (pp. 63-87) Bistol: Falmer Press.

Davies, E., Craig, D. & Robertson, N. (2005, April). Is the Performance Based Research Fund in the public interest? *New Zealand Journal of Tertiary Education Policy, 1* (2), 1-5.

Devos, A (2003). Academic standards, internationalisation, and the discursive construction of "The International Student". *Higher Education Research and Development, 22*, (2), 155-166.

Doherty, C. & Singh, P. (2005, November-December). International student subjectivities: Biographical investments for liquid times. Paper presented at the AARE conference, Western Sydney.

Furlong, J. & Onacea, A. (2005). *Assessing quality in applied and practice-based educational research: A framework for discussion*. Oxford: Department of Educational Studies, University of Oxford.

Furlong, J. & Oancea, A. (2006). Assessing quality in applied and practice-based research in education: a framework for discussion. In J. Blackmore, J. Wright, & V. Harwood, V. (Eds.). *Counterpoints on the quality and impact of educational research: Review of Australian Research in Education*, RARE 6, (pp. 89-104). The Australian Educational Researcher – Special Issue.

Gale, T. (2005, November). *Towards a theory and practice of policy activism: Higher education research policy in the making*. President's Address. Creative dissent: Constructive solutions. Australia Association for Research in Education conference, 27 November-1 December, Sydney: University of Western Sydney.

Gordon, L. & Whitty, G. (1997). Giving the 'Hidden Hand' a helping hand? The rhetoric and reality of neoliberal education reform in England and New Zealand. *Comparative Education 33* (3): 453-467.

Groundwater-Smith, S. & Mockler, N. (2006). Research that counts: practitioner research and the academy. In J. Blackmore, J. Wright, & V. Harwood, V. (Eds.). *Counterpoints on the quality and impact of educational research: Review of Australian Research in*

Education, RARE 6, (pp. 105-117). The Australian Educational Researcher – Special Issue.

Haigh, M. (2005). What counts as research under the PBRF environment? Considering the theoretical-applied distinctions . In R. Smith & J. Jesson, J. (Eds.). *Punishing the disciplines – the PBRF regime: Evaluating the position of education – where to from here?* (pp. 101-108). Auckland: AUT University and The University of Auckland.

Higgins, J. (2005). Outputs from research: Points for the PBRF? – Potential for professional impact? In R. Smith & J. Jesson, J. (Eds.). *Punishing the disciplines – the PBRF regime: Evaluating the position of education – where to from here?* (pp. 112-123). Auckland: AUT University and The University of Auckland.

Houston, D., Meyer, L. & Paewai, S. (2006). Academic staff workloads and job satisfaction: Expectations and values in academe. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 28* (1): 17-30.

Ingleton, C. & Cadman, K. (2005, December). Silent issues for international postgraduate research students: Emotion and agency in academic success. Paper presented at the AARE conference, Sydney.

Koehne, N. (2004, November-December). Positioning international education and international students: Multiple discourses and discursive practices. Paper presented at the AARE conference, Melbourne.

Koehne, N. (2006). (Be)Coming, (be)longing: ways in which international students talk about themselves. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education, 27* (2): 241-257.

Lewis, N. (2005). Code of practice for the pastoral care of international students: making a globalising industry. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 3* (1), 5-47.

McGrail, M., Rickard, C. & Jones, R. (2006). Publish or perish: a systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research & Development, 25* (1): 19-35.

Mazzarol, T., Soutar, G., & Seng, M. (2003). The third wave: Future trends in international education. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 17* (3), 90-99.

Meiras, S. (2004). International education in Australian universities: understandings, dimensions and problems. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 26* (3): 371-380.

Middleton, S. (2005). Disciplining the subject: The impact of PBRF on Education academics. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 40* (1-2), 131-156.

Morey, A (2004). Globalization and the emergence of for-profit higher education. *Higher Education, 48*, 131-150.

Morris Matthews, K. & Hall, C. (2006, February). The impact of the Performance-Based Research Fund on teaching and the research-teaching balance: Survey of a New Zealand university. Paper presented at the Symposium on the Evaluation of the PBRF. Wellington: Ministry of Education, Tertiary Education Commission and the Victoria University of Wellington, Institute of Policy Studies, 16-17 February.

Morton, M. & Gordon, L. (2005). What counts as research? Practitioner research as counter discourse. In R. Smith & J. Jesson, J. (Eds.). *Punishing the disciplines – the PBRF regime: Evaluating the position of education – where to from here?* (pp. 95-100). Auckland: AUT University and The University of Auckland.

Olssen, M. Codd, J., & O'Neill, A. (2004). *Education policy: Globalization, citizenship and democracy*. London: Sage Publications.

Ozga, J. (2000). *Policy research in educational settings: A contested terrain*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Pratt, G., & Poole, D. (1999). Globalisation and Australian universities: Policies and impacts. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management, 12* (6), 553-544.

Roberts, P. (2006). Performativity, measurement and research: A critique of New Zealand PBRF scheme. In J. Ozga, T. Seddon & T. Popkewitz (Eds.). *World Yearbook of Education 2006: Evaluation research and policy.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Singh, M., Han, J. & Harreveld, B. (2006). The generative impacts of Redistributive Quantum Funding: managing quality education research to extend talent, sustain openness and build toolkits. In J. Blackmore, J. Wright, & V. Harwood, V. (Eds.). *Counterpoints on the quality and impact of educational research: Review of Australian Research in Education*, RARE 6, (pp. 175-189). The Australian Educational Researcher – Special Issue.

Smith, D., Baston, L., Bocock, J., & Scott, P. (2002). Americanization and UK higher education: towards a history of transatlantic influence on policy and practice. *Journal of Education Policy*, *17* (4): 443-461.

Smith, R. (2003, November). *The internationalisation of the New Zealand secondary schooling sector: reviewing the recent trends.* Paper presented to the annual conference of the NZARE, Auckland, November-December.

Smith, R. (2004a). Looking at the internationalisation of primary and intermediate schools: A New Zealand perspective. *Perspectives on Educational Leadership*, 14 (6), 1-2.

Smith, R. (2004b). Selling our education: Income and diversity, or disadvantaging 'domestic' students? *Set: Research information for Teachers*, 3, 49-54.

Smith, R. (2004c). Increasing internationalisation of the primary sector: Funding the coffers and encouraging cultural diversity, or disadvantaging 'domestic' students? *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work*, 1 (1), 32-36. http://www.teacherswork.ac.nz/journal.html

Smith, R. (2004d). Invited editorial: Selling our education: Competing imperatives? *The International Principal*, *8* (2), 1-6.

Smith, R. (2005a, June). The 'forgotten little sister' in the international sector: The 'nanny state' effect in recent educational policy developments in the primary sector. *Reflective practice – the key to innovation in International Education Conference*. Centre for Research in International Education (CRIE), Auckland, 23 – 26 June.

Smith, R. (2005b). See Smith, Syddall and Taylor, below.

Smith, R. (2005c, November-December). PBRF its effects – watch out Australia your grades are next! Where will you fit between educations 'good' ranking under RAE in the UK, and 'bad' under the PBRF in Aotearoa/New Zealand. [Online]. *Creative dissent: Constructive solutions, Australian Association for Research in Education Conference*, pp. x-x. Sydney, Australia, 27 November - 1 December: http://www.aare.edu.au/05smixxx.pdf. ISSN [CD] and [web]

Smith, R. (forthcoming).Book review of M. Olssen, J. Codd & A. O'Neill (Eds.). (2004). 'Education policy: Globalization, citizenship and democracy'. In E. Grierson (Ed.). *The politics of globalisation, research and pedagogy, ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural and Policy Studies, 25* (2), October 2006.

Smith, R., Syddall, L. & Taylor, R. (2005). Leading – from theory into practice: Fostering a collaborative research partnership with academic-practitioners. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Leadership*, *20* (1) 29-45.

Smith, R. & Jesson, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Punishing the disciplines – the PBRF regime: Evaluating the position of education – where to from here?* Auckland: AUT University and The University of Auckland.

Thrupp, M. (1998). Exploring the politics of blame: School inspection and its contestation in New Zealand and England. *Comparative Education 34* (2): 195-208.

Thrupp, M. (2005). Importing England's 'Third Way' education policy: A cautionary note. In J. Codd & K. Sullivan (Eds.). *Education policy directions in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 101-113). Southbank, Victoria: Thomson Dunmore Press.

Turpin, T., Iredale, R., & Crinnion, P. (2002). The internationalization, of higher education: Implications for Australia and its education 'clients' *Minerva, 40* , 327-340.

Vidovich, L. (2004). Towards internationalizing the curriculum in a context of globalization: Comparing policy processes in two settings. *Compare, 34* (4), 443-461.

Walker, M. (2006). *Higher education pedagogies*. Maidenhead: Society for Research in Higher Education & Open University Press.

Whitty, G. (2006). Education(al) research and education policy making: Is it inevitable? *British Educational Research Journal, 32* (2), 159-176.

Yates, L. (2004). *What does good educational research look like?* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Yates, L. (2005, July). Is impact a measure of quality? Producing quality research as producing quality indicators of research in Australia. Keynote address for AARE Focus Conference on 'Quality of Educational Research: Directions in policy and practice, Cairns.

Yates, L. (2006). Research that counts: practitioner research and the academy. In J. Blackmore, J. Wright, & V. Harwood, V. (Eds.). *Counterpoints on the quality and impact of educational research: Review of Australian Research in Education*, RARE 6, (pp. 119-132). The Australian Educational Researcher – Special Issue.

Zimitat, C. (2005, July). Student perceptions of internationalisation of the undergraduate curriculum. Paper presented at the 'Higher education in a changing word', HERDSA conference, 3-6 July, Sydney.