Assembling Internationalization through Policies in the Governance of Higher Education

by

Melody May Viczko

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Educational Administration and Leadership

Department of Educational Policy Studies
University of Alberta

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to trace how relationships between global, national and local policy spheres are enacted as actors assemble in educational governance through their engagement with internationalization policy. Based on this purposes, the following research questions were addressed: 1) What are the assemblages of multi-scalar actors in higher education governance that are enacted through internationalization policy?; 2) What policy spaces are enacted through the assemblages of multi-scalar actors? 3) How does studying assemblage contribute to shifting policy platforms and relationships of internationalization and the global governance of higher education?

Drawing on the tools and sensibilities of Actor Network Theory and the concept of policy networks, this qualitative study used policy ethnography, whereby policy was the site of study, to trace the ways sociomaterial policy networks were assembled through internationalization policy at one Canadian university. As an interpretivist policy analysis, study methods were observations of key meetings; document analysis of strategic plans, policy statements and agreements related to internationalization processes; and interviews with policy actors at different levels of governance.

The findings of the study focus on three policy texts. First, the multiple performances of memorandums of understanding (MOUs) suggested they are political tools of inclusion and exclusion. The tinkering involved in bringing MOUs to reality was a process of change, shift, and fluidity that redefined the relations between actors through the determining of the conditions by which partnerships are enrolled with MOUs. Second, a proposal for funding was an important actor in bringing together knowledges for a research project. In the context of neoliberal market rationalities in higher

education, the findings in this study demonstrated that the proposal can be seen as part of a network that forms the social relations between different actors, located both at the university and abroad. Third, the networks formed around two Canadian national strategies for internationalization showed the enrolment of immigration and trade interests. Through competing efforts between the two texts, multiple framings of internationalization were produced through discursive and material practices, suggesting there are ontological politics at play in how internationalization policy is enacted across levels of engagement.

In conclusion, the saliency of the concept of assemblage demonstrated how powerful spaces of internationalization are not performed through the work of one lone actor. Rather, the ways in which power is generated through the actions of heterogenous networks of actors, who may be hidden and invisible, is an important analysis of internationalization policy processes. A consequence of this multiplicity is how power is performed through collective action in ways that designate what becomes important and legitimate in internationalization through interactions with policy. Recommendations for policy and practice focused on illuminating the multiplicity of actors engaged in internationalization work in order to better understand the relations that are performed through the connections between multi-scalar actors and how these relations matter in higher education governance.

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Melody May Viczko. The research project of which this thesis is a part, received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, Project Name "Enacting Globalized Policy Spaces in the Governance of Higher Education", No 00031446, June 18, 2012.

.

Dedication

To Tolga,
whose presence through the birth of many adventures in our lives is a gift I cherish.
I long for a lifetime of conversations together.
To Sam Tarek,
whose curiosity and zeal for understanding continually spring joy.
And to Sofia,
whose essence taught me that patience and peace come from within.

I dedicate this work to you.

Acknowledgements

It is with much gratitude that I thank my supervisor in the doctoral program. Dr. Lynette Shultz has given her time, mentorship, friendship and support in ways that were essential to my success. I am grateful for the many opportunities she made for us to work together but also our many conversations that pushed forward my thinking in this research project, especially those times shared sipping tea in Istanbul, writing in Izmir, strolling the streets of Grenoble and toiling in the CGCER office in Edmonton.

I also acknowledge the support from my supervisory committee members, Dr. Janice Wallace and Dr. Ali A. Abdi. Dr. Wallace provided support both in Edmonton and graciously into her retirement from beautiful Victoria, BC. It was with much pleasure that we were able to spend time at conferences when I worked as an RA on her research with Dr. Dawn Wallin. I am thankful for her mentorship towards my writing, my professional career, and my life as a mother/spouse/scholar. Dr. Abdi's call to never abandon the pursuit of learning and the critique of power in educational policy spaces has been key to my work. Dr. Abdi gave much of his time to share his ideas and suggestions and his encouraging belief in my efforts were always felt.

I recognize the gracious yet challenging questions and contributions from the examining committee, Dr. Reva Joshee, Dr. Randy Wimmer and Dr. Fern Snart. The exam was made memorable due to your attention to the dissertation. It was a humbling yet rewarding experience to talk with you about my work. Thank you for your time, questions and support.

There have been many friends and colleagues who have made my time in the doctoral program a life changing experience. Tania, Deb, Musembi, Thashika, Sasha, Neda, Lorin, Janine, Ev, Robert and David, I cherish the memories of our time in Edmonton. Thank you for bringing the laugher, joy and tears that fueled the drive to pursue this research through to the end. What a gift it is to know each of you.

My family has given endless time, love, encouragement, and patience. Tolga, your unending support of my work has been a foundation for my success. Thank you for listening to me struggle to articulate my writing, for challenging me to keep going, and for caring for our son while I felt torn away to finish this project. Mamer, Becky, April and Troy, you believed in me and I am so thankful that we are a family. Nick and Linda, you were an important part of my first few years in Edmonton. I am thankful that you opened your home to me and that you supported my efforts to make research my life! Without all of you, this accomplishment would not have been possible.

This research was partially funded with the support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One: Situating the Research Problem and Context

> Often the attachment is scarcely perceptible; Shakespeare's plays, for instance, seem to hang there complete by themselves. But when the web is pulled askew, hooked up at the edge, torn in the middle, one remembers that these webs are not spun in mid-air by incorporeal creatures, but are the work of suffering human beings, and are attached to grossly material things, like health and money and the houses we live in. (Woolf, 1929, p. 48-49).

Introduction

Contemporary educational reforms reflect a globalizing policy field, where policy recommendations and strategies link local, national and global policies. An example of such reforms is the increasing connections of university policies to national and international ideas, agendas and actors. Consequently, the boundaries between what is deemed local and global become blurred in the enactments of policies aimed at internationalizing higher education. Canadian universities have embraced internationalization as they develop policy and program initiatives through interactions between various actors, such as provincial governments, national organizations, federal government departments, and international organizations. As the opening quote from Virginia Woolf reminds us, connections permeate our existence. Yet, there is relatively little consideration of these trends in Canadian higher education institutional contexts nor how the governance of higher education is affected in the push to internationalize.

In this research, I conducted a study aimed at describing the ways in which the relationships between multi-scalar levels of governance are produced in the connections between policy actors in the internationalization of higher education. I drew upon actor-network theory (Latour, 2005; Law, 2009) to describe power relations produced through

the interactions between various multi-scalar actors and how such power relations perform to create stability in policy spaces. I was concerned with tracing how the relationships between global, national and local policy spheres are enacted in educational governance policy processes. To do so, I adopted an ethnographic approach to studying policy (Schatz, 2009a; Wedeen, 2009; Yanow, 2011) to trace the policy processes of internationalization within a multi-scalar network of policymakers. Beginning at a Canadian university, I traced the emerging network of multi-scalar actors that are connected to this university, to interrogate how relationships between multi-scalar institutions are negotiated in the interactions between these actors and the ways in which spaces such as global, national, and local actors across these multi-scalar levels come to be defined and maintained as powerful sites in the policy processes of contemporary governance.

The Problem

This dissertation topic emerged from two of my policy studies interests. First, I was curious about the ways in which policies seem to be transported around the globe in contemporary governance. This interest began with my master's research using a comparative study between teacher professional learning in Alberta and England. Second, I was interested to engage interpretive policy studies as a means to theoretically and conceptually examine how policy actors make sense of global policy pressures and initiatives in their local contexts. The convergent area of study in both these interests lies in the field of global governance, specifically with understanding globalizing policies in local contexts. As I sought a context in which to develop these convergent policy

interests, several salient moments influenced my thinking on this topic that I elaborate here.

I attended a conference hosted by the University of Alberta, entitled, Canada's Responses to the Bologna Process. I attended the conference as a graduate student delegate and questioned conflicting points of tension between ideas focused on the techno-rational objectives of internationalization expressed at the conference and the philosophical questions we took up in Dr. Shultz's Global Governance in Educational Policy Processes course. At the conference and through the course readings, two concepts repeatedly piqued my interest: 1) that policymakers and university administrators were converging on the topic of internationalization policy development without significant evidence of public discussion about the goals of such projects, and 2) that notions of global and local become fuzzy and obscure in the discourses focused on internationalization of higher education as universities projected their work as important on the global scale. The second point was striking for me, as it offered a practical real-life example of how globalization has altered our understandings of policy spaces and that the impact of this on policy processes means that if you want to understand global policies, you can experience them very locally.

This conference acted as a springboard to pique my interest in the area of global governance, and higher education policies related to internationalization became a particularly salient context in which to explore my research interests. Consequently, I attended several other conferences with this focus, at which I purposefully pursued conversations with scholars and policymakers regarding who is involved in internationalization policies at the university level, who is working with whom, and what

sorts of policy knowledge are consequently excluded in these processes. Furthermore, I often heard Canadian university administrators, bureaucrats from government departments (most often national governments, even though education is a provincial jurisdiction), and nationally based organizations (such as the former Association for Universities and Colleges of Canada, currently Universities Canada) tell the gathered audiences about what their organization was doing globally, who their international partners were and why their work was significant in a more globally understood notion of the policy field. As I interacted in these contexts, I began to question how all of these actors were connected and how their interactions with each other work to define how we understand the concepts of global and local actor among these players. Furthermore, I wondered how we should research the exchange of ideas and policy knowledges between these players.

Finally, my attendance at a conference in Vancouver in the spring of 2011 raised further questions for me regarding what is happening in the Canadian context. A session in which leading scholars in the area of global governance, Susan Robertson and Pavel Zgaga, and Karen McBride, a director from the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, presented on current trends both in Canada and internationally around internationalization in higher education proved to be fruitful to my thinking about this research. At this session, a university professor and vice-president adamantly stated that the Canadian context offered something unique in the international arena, in that institutional autonomy was privileged in Canadian higher education governance more than in any other context, and other Canadian scholars in the audience echoed this sentiment. Robertson and Zgaga reflected on trends internationally, around how national

authority is challenged as universities struggle to set themselves apart on the global stage and the increasing development of regional hubs for partnerships and program development. Increasingly, I began to seriously question how we could understand the relationship between the global, national and local actors in the global governance field of education and how this dilemma should be studied.

Consequently, I proposed this study with a concern to question the ways in which the distinctions between multi-scalar levels of global, national, regional and local are enacted in the governance of internationalization policies and how the negotiations of power between actors embroiled in policy processes serve to allow for the existence, privileging and exclusion of both actors and forms of policy knowledge in the ordering of higher education governance. I drew upon the notion of an assemblage of actors through Actor-Network Theory (ANT) (Latour, 1988, 1999, 2003, 2005; Law, 1999, 2003, 2005) and policy enactments (Braun, Maguire & Ball, 2010) in an interpretive policy analysis approach.

It is important to note my focus in this study was connections. That is, this study is not about how policy actors understand or conceptualize the global, national or local as a cognitive process or how they understand the relationship between these levels, rather the focus is tracing what internationalization policy does to construct the relationships between the multi-scalar levels of actors and the dynamics that exist in such interactions. To this end, I was interested to examine how such interactions can help us to understand the ways in which policy processes in educational governance provide insights to how contemporary governance works in the context of globalizing education policy fields (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). I place incredible value on participation and how those who

participate enact power relations in most things they do. What I am drawn to in ANT analyses is the struggle to not only see the materialization and operationalization of power, but to seek to look at how this struggle plays out through connection between actors. That is, I am sympathetic to ANT's position that the purpose of research is to seek understanding of how social systems operate and in what ways this matters in the ordering of our social worlds.

Consequently, the approach used in the study was concerned with how "the power structure that generates a network becomes hidden or masked" (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 243). The problem that this study addressed is the lack of understanding in current scholarship of the interactions between actors located at different scalar localities throughout policymaking processes and is based upon two main theoretical assumptions about contemporary policymaking.

The first is a significant change in how we understand collective decision making in plural societies, noting the shift from notions of government to the focus on governance (Rhodes, 1997). Recent attention in policy research to the interconnectedness among educational policy actors in the context of globalization calls for increased awareness of a shift in governance (Rhodes, 2006) towards more networked interactions between policy actors in the exchange of knowledge and ideas. In particular, a focus on the changing role of the nation state in education reform has taken saliency in current policy analysis research (Dale & Robertson, 2007a; Hartmann, 2007; Leuze, Martens & Rusconi, 2007; Marginson, 2010; Robertson, 2009; Trilokekar, 2009). Additionally, the role of non-governmental actors, such as policy advocacy groups and international organizations, has taken a more centralized role in educational policy studies.

Consequently, policy networks are becoming increasingly more important in policy processes on a global scale and in Canadian policymaking (Pal, 2010). Indeed, policy networks have emerged as "master concepts for conceptualizing new patterns of players and institutions" (p. 256).

Policy network analysis provides a powerful frame to understand the complexity of policy emerging from this context. In this study, networks were not seen as mere linear connections between players, but rather networks are conceived as nodes or links of messy negotiations, conflicts and contestations through which stability and order seem to emerge (Fenwick, 2010; Nespor, 2004). That is, in networks, certain kinds of materials and people are assembled and translated to become aligned as unified concepts and ideas, such as particular forms of policy knowledge.

Second, this study aimed to draw and build upon the effects of globalization on educational policy processes, resulting in reforms being mediated through multi-scalar interactions of policies, actors, and ideas (Campbell, 2004; Dale & Robertson, 2007a; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). An increase in the study of interacting policy ideas between actors considered to be internationally, regionally, nationally or locally located has taken particular salience among scholars through studies that focus on contemporary models of governance (Bevir & Rhodes, 2006), policy networks (Vidovich, 2007), notions of multi-scalar policy (Dale & Robertson, 2007a) and deliberative policy processes (Hajer & Wagenaar, 2003). This is not surprising in a global context where policy recommendations and strategies developed by global organizations often link local, national and global policies (Mundy & Murphy, 2001; Neu & Ocampo, 2007).

However, importantly, Rizvi (2006) reminds us that the work of globalization happens at the local level. The neoliberal agenda to privilege market rationalities in higher education (ie. more students who pay more money, research collaborations that increase economic ties between university, state and international collaborator) (Olssen & Peters, 2006) has become so pervasive that it seems normal. Rizvi's call to challenge the reification of globalizing processes as inevitable resonates with my own thoughts about agency for change. While the link between local, national and global policies seems present, it is the means of what holds these relations together that is not always known to all actors, as Gaventa (2006) suggested. Exploring these relations is not merely descriptive. It is my hope that doing so allows for an examination of what is held as powerful so that these sites may challenged and brought into the public spaces in which all affected can participate, an important move for democratizing internationalization.

Context of the Study

To understand the changing relations between global, nation state, local actors in the governance of education as they are enacted throughout various policy processes, I examined the interactions between an assemblage of actors involved in higher education governance that are committed to internationalizing Canadian universities. Locating the study in higher education was particularly relevant to help understand the interactions between multi-scalar actors. Current processes of globalization act as economic, political, and societal forces that propel higher education towards significantly greater international involvement (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Increasing convergence and interdependence between nation-states and regional partners in higher education means university structures may operate as though they are disembedded from their national contexts "due

to the intensification of transnational flows of people, information and resources" (Beerkens, 2004, p. 24).

While internationalization has been embraced by Canadian universities (Beck, 2009; Weber, 2004), there has been relatively little examination of how these trends are playing out in Canadian higher education institutional contexts nor how the governance of higher education is affected in the push to internationalize. Individual institutions have largely taken the lead (Jones, 2009) in various bi-lateral agreements with mechanisms focused on internationalizing the curriculum, materializing study abroad practicum experiences for Canadian students, attracting top researchers, and recruiting international students. However, the policy terrain is not thoroughly interrogated in the Canadian scholarly literature (Shubert, Jones & Trilokekar, 2009). More thorough research is needed to understand the ways in which policy knowledge is constructed through various actors in Canadian higher education (Jones, 2009). Furthermore, a gap in the Canadian literature to examine contemporary processes of educational governance through higher education policymaking is even more glaring. The aim of this research is to make a significant contribution to this filling this gap.

This gap is important in contemporary studies of higher education because the work of internationalization is not happening only at the levels of bi-lateral agreements between universities and their partners abroad, nor only at the level of the individual student embedded in a particular program at one university, though these certainly do matter. Challenges to the nation state as the centre of governance is occurring at different levels of policymaking (Dale & Robertson, 2007a). While internationalization happens by many actors across scales, this research set out to explore the relations between these

scales through the enactments of internationalization policy. The network analysis engaged in this research is about understanding how actors assemble, the things that hold them together in these assemblages and how such assembling orders higher education through the actions at the micro-level. As Hajer and Wagenaar (2003) suggest, policy network analysis is about more than understanding who is acting with whom because the governance through networks "reshape what politics and policymaking are about" (p. 2). Here, understanding how assemblages shape and reshape the relations in which governance is enacted is steeped in a belief the such assemblages are made and can be re-made (Mol, 1999) with a cause towards shifting power imbalances inherent in what is assembled. The project of mapping relations, argued Robertson et al. (2005), is never apolitical.

Situating ANT in Terms of the Study

While ANT is not new in qualitative research, some terms may need situating in the context of this study. Many of these terms are elaborate further later in this text in the discussions on theoretical concepts and methodology. However, some introduction to the terms as they are used in this study follows.

The notion of *assemblage* focuses on the interactions between humans and non-humans, not individuals as independent, static entities themselves. Key to this study is Shore & Wright 's (2011) argument for thinking about policies "as 'assemblages' rather than discrete things" (p. 20).

Translation describes what happens when things connect, both human and non-human things, changing one another and forming links (Latour, 1987). Studies using ANT focus on how things become *punctualized*, that is, stable and fixed, and to explore

the relations in place that perform such stability. Messy networks are invisible, or become *black-boxed* (Latour, 2005), to hide the networks of relations that toil to perform realities.

The term *mediator* has been invoked to describe the fluidity and change that occurs through translation (Latour, 2005). A mediator circulates through the network to "transform, distort and modify the meaning in the elements" (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, p. 11).

Power is not seen initially as a cause, but rather effect, through the processes of translation (Law, 2003) as things connect. Power is core to ANT studies to consider how politics work to constrain and enable certain enactments (Fenwick, 2010b). As Latour states, the focal point of power in ANT studies in to examine how collective action comes about, how actors come to be associated and what happens when these associations work together. Here, power is conceptualized in a post-structuralist view (Rose, 1999), as it is both productive and constraining, circulating through shifting webs of relations.

The notion of *multi-scalar* governance indicates that policy processes take place through the actions and involvement of actors located across policy scales. An example might be policies that are enacted through actors at local, provincial, national and global levels.

Purpose

This qualitative study was situated within the broad parameters of interpretive policy analysis through its aims to examine the ways in which policy is enacted through the interactions between policy actors. Interpretive policy analysis is fundamentally concerned with "political actions, institutions, meaning, and the reality-shaping power of meaning" (Wagenaar, 2011, p. 3). As Yanow (1995) so succinctly asked, "*How* does a

policy mean?", calling attention to how policies work and what they do. Brock, McGee and Gaventa (2004) argued that actors, knowledge and policy spaces interact in complex processes in the making and doing of policy. These processes are imbued with historical, cultural and political significance involving ambiguous but significant power relations that "shape all aspects of the context, the policy spaces themselves and the way actors and knowledge interrelate in them" (McGee, 2004, p. 23). Such notions of policy assume a lens through which to study processes of political transformation, understanding policy as "a social and political space articulated through relations of power and systems of governance" (Shore & Wright, 1997, p. 14). In this study, I adopt the position that policy works to categorize and organize people and ideas (Shore & Wright, 2011). Consequently, I see policy as a powerful tool, both as text and practice, and we can understand how such policy works to shape our world by studying the processes through which it is enacted.

In this study, I drew upon the research tools and sensibilities offered by Actor-Network Theory (ANT) (Latour, 2005; Law, 1997) to inform the methodology of the research. ANT suggests that through tracing how scalar boundaries are enacted through assemblages of policy actors (both human and non-human) engaged in particular policy processes we can understand the actor-networks that operate to order the social world (Law, 2009). In this way, the study is positioned to move beyond understandings of how particular aspects of policy are transmitted, interpreted or diffused from one part of the globe to another, from one organization to another, or more locally, from one actor to another. Rather, this study draws upon the sensibilities of ANT to understand that knowledge is enacted through an assemblage of actors.

I engaged ANT in order to examine "how effects emerge from networks of interests and actions" (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, p. 131). Given that scale is a key focus of this study, ANT analyses offered a relevant look at moving beyond the scalar distinctions that separate global and local policy spaces (Nespor, 2004) to recognize that everything is local (Latour, 2005), meaning that the global does not exist "far out there", removed from what is practiced in everyday actions of policymaking. In a policy context, this means that policy knowledge for internationalization is not assembled and generated through practices contained within global sites such as international organizations or in local university institutions or departments. Rather, I sought to explore how the governance of higher education occurs in enactments across assemblages of actors, both human and non-human, engaged in doing internationalization. All sites are actively producing policy knowledge that serves to categorize, order and make stable the relationships between the multi-scalar levels of practice.

While the ontological and epistemological assumptions imbedded in this study are further explored in the methodology section of this study, at this point, I want to note that contemporary models of governance call for methods of study that can examine, interrogate and begin to understand the complexity of actors involved in policy processes (Braun, Ball, Maguire & Hoskins, 2011; Dryzek & Dunleavy, 2009; Shore & Wright, 2011; Yanow, 2011). Using a policy ethnography approach (Schatz, 2009a; Wedeen, 2009; Yanow, 2009; 2011), this research places policy as the focus of study by concentrating on how policy works to connect. Therefore, the focus moves from the "what" of policy often examined in the ideological study of discourse analysis to examining the "how" of policy. This shift in focus is significant as it bring attention to

the *processes* involved in educational governance. I am concerned with how governance practices materialize power relations with everyday consequences for the lives of educators, students and policymakers and the societies in which they both engage and create. In stating the significance of such ethnographic approaches to policy, Auyero & Joseph (2007) commented, "large-scale political transformations have ground-level sources and effects" (p. 2). My approach to policy analysis in this study aimed to understand how policy connects actors across scales and how such connections construct boundaries of what becomes powerful in higher education. At the heart, there is a concern for understanding what is included, excluded and considered as authoritative and legitimate, so that we can seek opportunities whereby policies may be changed and governance itself be rendered more democratic (Olssen, 2004; Vidovich, 2007).

Research Questions

Based on these purposes, I examined the following research questions:

1) What are the assemblages of multi-scalar actors in higher education governance that are enacted through internationalization policy?
2) What policy spaces are enacted through the assemblages of multi-scalar actors?
3) How does studying assemblage contribute to shifting the policy platforms and relationships of internationalization and the global governance of higher education?

Significance

To begin with, this study filled a gap in the literature about the contemporary practices and processes of educational governance in a globalizing policy field (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Research is needed to understand recent shifts in governance towards

policy networks because of the ways in which "they reshape what politics and policymaking are about" (Hajer & Wagenaar, 2003, p. 2). The approach to the research context in this study is significant because it aims to build understandings of the complexity of interactions between multi-scalar assemblages of actors that dominant technocratic analyses are currently inadequate to inform (Dryzek, 2006). Interpretive policy analysis is concerned with understanding *how* policy works in order to seek opportunities and moments to shift imbalance of power in the process. Such approaches to policy analysis entail "opening up and sustaining a space for reflection by critical and reasoning subjects. They may be unequally positioned, but they can still exercise their creativity in shaping the kind of institutions and policy worlds that they would wish to inhabit" (Shore & Wright, 2011, p. 21). Research into policy networks brings the assembling work to the fore, hoping to make visible how power functions to govern higher education.

Also, even though the view of internationalization as a common good in higher education permeates policies and practices as Canadian universities and Canadian governments are subjected to pressures to address internationalization strategies (Shubert, Jones & Trilokekar, 2009), the context of processes of internationalization in the governance of higher education in Canada is not yet well studied. As Shubert, Jones & Trilokekar (2009) noted, "we are left with a phenomenon that everyone agrees is important but one that no one is studying and, outside of a few annual meetings of relevant organizations and a small group of government officials, no one is talking about" (p. 10). The goals of this study contributed to knowledge in Canada in this area.

However, this study's aims involved a depth and breadth beyond understanding the assemblage of actors intertwined in Canadian higher education governance. This study is an entry point for conceiving new relationships between the multi-scalar assemblages of actors involved in processes of global governance. Studies comparing governance in other universities or international contexts may further findings from this research study to deepen insights about how multi-scalar relations enact the boundaries of policy spaces in contemporary governance.

Finally, I seek to interrogate how the use of the concept of assemblage can better conceptualize the interactions of policy actors involved in the global governance of educational policy. While Actor Network-Theory figured prominently in social science fields throughout the 1980's and 1990's, its presence in educational research is emerging (Edwards, 2011). Challenging the ways in which institutional theories privilege stabile, cohesive and unified outcomes, ANT focuses on "how distinct networks develop around conflicting definitions and interpretations that produce those outcomes" (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 242). The use of ANT provides a new approach to global governance studies by focusing on things that become assembled through relations and how such assemblages serve to order educational governance.

Limitations & De-limitations

This study is delimited to tracing interactions between multi-scalar actors involved in internationalization policy by beginning with one university in Canada. This means that while the goal was to trace networks of actors involved in policy processes related to those at one university, the aim of this study is not to claim that all actors will be represented. Rather than a broad based study, this research will examine the

relationships between actors as they emerge as the connections between actors are followed. This research is naturalist in its orientation in that it is conducted "*between and among* investigator and respondents" (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 111) in the natural context in which the phenomenon occurs. Consequently, the naturalistic approach used in this study requires that the researcher trace the connections by following the actors, both human and non-human (Latour, 2005; Law, 2008), such as policy texts, meetings, and position papers.

The limitations in this study are those associated with qualitative research in general. The purpose of this study is not to generalize the findings to the field of Canadian higher education. Rather, the purpose of this study is to understand how policy processes emerge through relations of particular actors in the field. In addition, as with all qualitative naturalistic inquiry, the behaviour of the participants may be affected by my presence as researcher and my perspective as a researcher is not considered value-free nor neutral but is rather informed by the assumptions and literature base presented in chapters two and three.

Chapter Two: Literature Review and Theoretical Perspectives

Introduction

Rizvi warned that "in an era of globalisation, the processes internal to the nation state are affected, in a deep sense, by the broader global processes, even if these are articulated and refracted through the local specificities" (Rizvi, 2006, p. 200). Furthermore, he asserted, if we are to avoid the deterministic trend of globalizing hegemonic policies embedded in the capitalist privileging of the centrality of the state, then we must awaken a sense of political agency to avoid reifying global processes and regarding the basic tenets of neo-liberalism as inevitable. Rizvi contended we need to locate local and national educational policy process within a broader framework of the global systems of power relations, interconnectivity and interdependence.

In this study, I was concerned with tracing how the relationships between global, national and local policy spheres are enacted in educational governance policy processes. I conducted a study of the policy actors involved in internationalizing Canadian higher education to begin to interrogate this research question. The literature review presented in this chapter will cover topics that are crucial to my research and include: globalization, global governance, policy networks, internationalization of higher education with a focus on such processes in Canada, interpretive and critical policy analyses, and the conceptual tools from Actor-Network Theory that informed my approach in this study. In the last section of the chapter, the research questions are presented in preparation for the methodology section, which will follow in chapter three.

Globalization

Scholte (2000) identified four cul-de-sacs in conceptualizing globalization: globalization-*as*-*internationalization* (cooperation and competition between individual and groups of nation states), -*as*-*liberalization* (related to the market and to free trade principles), -*as*-*universalism* (the global spread of norms and practices), and –*as*-*westernization* (the hegemonic dominance of the western markets, norms and principles throughout the globe). However, Pal (2006) focused attention on the interconnectivity between economic and cultural components of globalization. Economic globalization is characteristically driven by free-market capitalism as "the more countries integrate with the world economy and allow global economic forces to penetrate domestic economies, the more they will prosper" (p. 45). For Pal, the economic aspects of globalization involve the logic of international balancing of power at various levels of interaction: between nation states, between nation states and markets, and between individuals and nation states. Yet, Pal pointed to tension that arises as nation states internalize and institutionalize globalization in their national policies as they seek to balance the economic goal seeking against identity and community. Pal's conceptualization of globalization demarked a character of tension for nation states, and those embedded within its borders, to resist and shift in globalized policy conditions.

Olssen (2004) focused on two *senses* of globalization. First, he conceptualized a notion of globalization as descriptor, *interconnectedness*, characterized by increased speed and volume of trans-border capital and communication transactions, developments in technology that have rapidly assisted in mobility, and enhanced access to transportation (i.e. more affordable air fare and transit systems). Second, he

conceptualized globalization as a *discursive system*, indicating a more intricate interaction between states and international forms of capital at the policy level. In this way, globalization involves "neoliberal orthodoxy (open borders, floating exchange rates, abolition of capital controls, etc.), deregulation and liberalization of government policy and establishment of highly integrated private transnational systems of alliances and privatization and marketization, also the growth of private international authorities" (p. 241).

In a critical examination of Poulantzas's (1975; 1978) work on the imperialist nation state, Jessop (2003) pointed to the failure of contemporary globalization studies to situate analysis in terms of class struggles. Jessop agreed with Poulantzas' position of "posing the question of internationalization in terms of imperialism" (p. 2), situating it within the class struggles with which it is linked. He pointed out Poulantzas' focus on the essential need to link contemporary imperialism to the international socialization of labour processes and their effect on the global relations of production, critiquing the term globalization for its treatment of "a single 'world capitalist mode of production'" (Jessop, 2003, p. 7). Jessop concurred, emphasizing that state power is a social relation and globalization is "a process that involves the uneven development of the imperialist chain" (p. 9).

In the context of post-colonial scholarship, Quijano (2000) maintained that globalization is "the culmination of a process that began with the constitution of America and colonial/modern Eurocentered capitalism as a new global power" (p. 533). Central to understanding the current hegemonic model of global power, Quijano argued, is the recognition of the element of coloniality embedded in the global structures of

globalization. “Both race and the division of labour remained structurally linked and mutually enforcing” (p. 536) in the new model of global Eurocentric capitalism. Globalization, he argued, should be understood as a world-capitalist system, structuring different forms of labour according to colonial and hegemonic constructions of race that serve to locate centre-periphery relations. According to Quijano, a state of coloniality of power permeates beyond colonial relations, whereby peripheral divisions of labour are allocated and secured through the control of material relations and intersubjectivities of global capitalism. Indeed, Appadurai (1996) recognized vernacular globalization as changing and reconfiguring the global, national and local interrelationships but called attention to the importance of local histories and political backgrounds in which such relationships are made, adopting the understanding that “globalisation does not impinge on all nation states and at all times in exactly the same way” (Lingard & Rizvi, 2000, p. 201). As Giddens succinctly stated: “Globalisation invades local contexts but it does not destroy them; on the contrary, new forms of local cultural identity and self-expression are causally bound up with globalising processes” (Giddens, 1996, p. 367-368).

The point of this study is not to debate the shortcomings of particular theoretical standpoints of globalization theories. However, what the above brief review of conceptualizations of globalization offers is initial ground to interrogate the effect of globalization on educational governance and policymaking. Dale and Robertson (2007a) emphasized that a definitive understanding of globalization is not necessary in order to recognize the major challenges it has brought to the study of comparative education. This statement applies beyond the scope of comparative education to encompass broader policy and practices in the field of education and other social areas. More broadly, Rizvi

(2006) invoked the notion of globalization as demarking a new role for the imagination of social life (Appadurai, 2001), whereby new forms of collaboration disrupt boundaries of centralized local communities to involve processes that span national boundaries. For Rizvi, "social imaginaries play a major role in making policies authoritative, in securing consent and becoming legitimate" (p. 198), bringing together factual and normative aspects of policies in order to enable people to construct shared understandings of social policy problems.

Globalization and the Shift to Governance

For the last two decades, with the rise of new globalization processes, there has been a shift in the ways in which nation states have addressed educational provision and governance (Leuze, Martens & Rusconi, 2007), undermining the validity of the nation state (Dale & Robertson, 2007a). It is also the move from a Westphelian to post-Westphelian mode of international relations that Rizvi and Lingard (2010) often referred to as post-national global spaces and relations. Additionally, the advent of the knowledge-based economy has served to redefine the relationship between economy and education, resulting in conceptual challenges to both the structures and contents of national educational systems (Robertson, 2005). In discussions of the impacts of globalization on national public policymaking, the notion of governance often is invoked to denote "the process and outcome of policy making shared by various actors who interact in a non-hierarchical way" (Leuze, Martens & Rusconi, 2007, p. 8). In the context of broader public policy arenas, Rhodes (1997) was among the first to theorize the shift in policy decision-making from government to *governance,* "self-organizing,

interorganizational networks characterized by interdependence, resource exchange, rules of the game and significant autonomy from the state" (p. 15).

Dale and Robertson (2007b) extended this conceptualization to include the notion of coordination across scales as an integral aspect of policymaking. For these scholars, educational governance is defined as "the combinations and co-ordinations of activities, actors/agents, and scales, through which 'education' is constructed and delivered in national societies" (p. 116). Ball (2008) stated that the transitioning from government to governance has manifested in the emergence of a globalized post-Keynesian policy consensus, marking the emergence of a more polycentric state with a commitment to new education policy production rules, what he called new policy technologies "involv[ing] the calculated deployment of forms of organization and procedures, and disciplines or bodies of knowledge, to organize human forces and capabilities into functioning systems" (p. 41). The Commission on Global Governance of the UN noted the shift to governance to include non-state actors in order to enhance intergovernmental relationships by "involving nongovernmental organizations, citizens' movements, multinational corporations, and the global capital market" (Commission on Global Governance, 1995, p. 2).

However, Dale and Robertson (2007a) have critiqued methodologies of comparative education for the ways in which concepts such as the state, national systems, and even education itself are taken for granted. Therefore, such an approach to the study of educational governance takes these concepts as "unproblematic and assumes a constant and shared meaning" (p. 1113), which is problematic for interrogating their current meaning given shifts in governance. Dale and Robertson drew attention to a need

to study the ways in which globalization has transformed institutional everyday life. In their discussion, they argued that the changes of the scale and the means of governance at and through which education is carried out needs to be questioned. Based on the belief that globalization has shifted modes and contents of governance, they argued for a shift in methodological approaches, arguing "it has rarely ever been the case that 'the state did it all'… that educational activities and governance have ever been confined to the national scale and that 'education' has ever been a single, straightforward, unproblematic conception" (p. 1114). Ball (1998) similarly claimed an uncertain and indeterminate role for the state in educational policymaking.

> National policymaking is inevitably a process of bricolage; a matter of borrowing and copying bits and pieces of ideas from elsewhere, drawing upon and amending locally tried and tested approaches, cannibalising theories, research trends and fashions and not infrequently flailing around for anything at all that looks as though it might work. (p. 126)

The consequence of such thinking for the study of educational governance requires new approaches that seek not only to understand how educational governance is re-conceptualized through changing practices and policymaking processes, but also to interrogate what this means for the shift in power relations and boundaries inherently embedded in governance structures and activities.

Claims of Authority in Contemporary Global Governance

An important consequence to Dale and Robertson's (2007a; 2007b) scholarship is the idea that new patterns of globalization have changed how governance occurs. They suggested that challenges to the nation state as the centre for educational governance is occurring from several different levels of educational policymaking – from national

organizations within the state's boundaries, from global and international organizations such as the OECD and World Bank, and from local institutions, including universities. Their argument is that current practices of governance involve different frames of educational governance happening at different scales. Consequently, this also involves different representations of what constitutes education as an entity itself. That is, there are functional and scalar differences happening and these operate through parallel and hybrid operations (Dale & Robertson, 2007a). Such operations do not replace what happens at any one particular scale but suggest that the nation state is not the only structure to locate governance. More specifically, they argued, that at the national and sub-national levels, the generic characteristics of education are seen as being politically mediated, "framed and interpreted in various but not fundamentally challenging ways" (p. 1120); at supra-national levels, there is "rather a project of appropriating them, and attaching them to the wider political project" (p. 1120). Consequently, they argued, it is not sufficient to rest analysis at a methodological statement that globalization changed the ways in which governance practices occur but what is needed is a deeper exploration of how those practices are mediated and negotiated in the complexity of interactions between multi-scalar actors and how such interactions operate to shift boundaries of governance in ways that redefine the concept of education itself. Such questions raise issues of authority for governance.

Examining the effects of globalization on educational governance from an institutionalism framework, Meyer, Boli, Thomas & Ramirez (1997) have focused on the outcomes of educational policy, showing how educational systems have become more alike through policy convergence both across various localities in the world and through

time. While their focus on international organizations shows that the impact of particular globalized players in diffusing particular policy agendas and ideas, their research is critiqued for failing to address "how governance is exercised" (Leuze, Martens & Rusconi, 2007, p. 9).

The seminal work of DiMaggio and Powell (1983) has been used extensively in studies drawing upon institutional theory to explain the ways in which isomorphism works through diffusion and mimicry. However, such models of diffusion and policy convergence have been challenged by scholars for failing to explicitly explain change. In particular, some argued, it is important not to see the global institutions as "similar actors with similar interests on a similar stage, but to view them as part of a complex set of social forces and patternings which change over time" (Dale & Robertson, 2007b, p. 219). Dale and Robertson suggested educational governance takes place through four *activities* of governance (funding, provision or delivery, ownership and regulation); four *scales* of governance (supra-national, national, regional and local); and through four *institutions* of coordination (state, market, community and household). They argued that we ought to begin to see education as "constituted through complex working of functional and scalar divisions of the labour of educational governance" (p. 1117). Such recognition allows for variances in educational governance, with possibilities from single locus of governance, parallel loci across scales or hybrid forms across scales, activities and agents. The work of educational research, they argued, is to examine the specificities in which the practice of governance is happening.

Martens, Rusoni and Leuze (2007) offered that internationalization and processes of marketization have emerged as new arenas in educational governance. These scholars

pointed out the failings of studies into the effects of marketization as being descriptive, and failing neither to make links between the market and educational policymaking nor to effectively clarify the relationship between the market and national educational policymaking. In a collection of works examining the emergence of international organizations and the market as arenas in the governance of educational policymaking, the authors called for a re-thinking of how governance works in educational spaces, offering the insight that while the nation state may have lost its exclusive position in controlling educational governance, "nations states, IOs and market might be hostile siblings in the governance of education" (Weymann, Martens, Rusconi & Leuze, 2007, p. 238).

Tensions of Autonomy and Legitimacy in Globalized Policy Spaces

From an understanding of globalization as a dynamic of directives between global, national and local levels of policy processes, Vidovich (2004) tackled the question of how autonomy for universities is maintained in her case study of quality policy in Australian universities. The case examined interactions of policy processes at the global, national and local levels of Australian higher education and consisted of interviews with members of the national Australian Universities' Quality Agency to determine how these actors understood the interactions of various levels of quality policy processes. Drawing upon Marginson and Rhoades' (2002) "glonacal agency heuristic" for analysis, Vidovich examined interconnected dimensions of organization and human agency. In conclusion, Vidovich conceded that, while harmonization and dissemination are evident among policy processes, there is significant agency and autonomy at the national level to control policy adoption, rather than mere cloning of policy from global to national level through

policy convergence. Vidovich's research serves as an entrance to examining cross-sections of policy levels. While her research is limited in its scope of actors and policy contexts, Vidovich's findings that challenge the notion of policy convergence resonate with other scholars who examine the effects of globalization on policy processes.

Ozga (2005) highlighted the power of local and national political histories to shape how globalized policy pressures are addressed in more localized policy spaces. In looking at how educational policy differs between the British countries of Scotland and England, Ozga argued against the notion that global supra-national institutions act as omnipresent forces of deterministic convergence on local policies as the UK government sought to modernize educational and other public sectors. Ozga highlighted the relevance of the distinction between travelling and embedded policy structures (Jones & Alexadiou, 2001). Travelling policies refers to supra-national and transnational activities and agendas, such as the development of human capital for the knowledge economy, as Ozga suggested. Embedded policy, however, carries a more spatial dimension, in which the focus is on local spaces, though they may be defined as national, regional and local in comparison to globalized spaces. As Ozga put it, embedded policies "come up against existing priorities and practices….allow[ing] for recognition that, while policy choices may be narrowing, national and local assumptions and practices remain significant and mediate or translate global policy in distinctive ways" (Ozga, 2005, p. 209). In conclusion to her study, Ozga argued for the need to recognize "the politics of educational change as well as the policy drivers of change" (p. 217) when travelling policies intersect with local existing policy, recognizing such interaction as a political rather than technical process. Her position echoed what Ball (2001) claimed earlier as

"the intermingling of global, distant and local logics" (p.133), arguing, "national policies need to be understood as the product of a nexus of influences and interdependencies" (p. 133).

Focusing on tensions between globalization and nationalism, Zgaga (2009) questioned considering the legitimacy of internationalization and globalism in education by asking, "Can education contribute to a better world?" While Zgaga recognized that international interaction in education is not a new phenomenon, he argued the impact of globalization on nation state control has led to increased educational co-operation across nation states at a level not seen before and, therefore, the role of nation states in this capacity is uncertain. By example, Zgaga considered the continuing development of the Bologna Process in higher education as evidence of the changed role of nation states' control. He argued the role of the nation state in this context is caught between local community interests and international convergence of systems, meaning education policy makers now face a dilemma: serving economic prosperity and development as well as identity and tradition. In conclusion, Zgaga reframed his initial question: "Can education contribute to a better world today and what is a particular role of international co-operation at this point?" (p. 10).

The Influences of Political Economy on the Study of Governance

Drawing on insights from political economy and state theory, Jessop (2003) was critical of analyses that treat the increase of governance as equating a loss of power to the state, as though power were "a zero-sum resource rather than a social relation" (p. 13). He suggested that the shift to governance involves the "complex steering of multiple agencies, institutions and systems that are both operationally autonomous from one

another and structurally coupled through various forms of reciprocal interdependence" (p. 13). In doing so, the state does not necessarily lose power. In fact, the shift to governance could reflect possibilities for the state to enhance its influence "by mobilizing knowledge and power resources from influential non-governmental partners or stakeholders" (p. 13) or to protect key decisions concerning the state from popular-democratic control. In the context of governance, Jessop (2003) argued, the state may be only one among many institutionally separate actors yet it retains the sole responsibility for the overall balance of class relations and maintenance of social cohesion stemming from Keynesian structures. For Jessop, while the changes brought about by globalization do not amount to a "fundamental challenge to the nation state" (p. 15), three aspects of the relationship between globalization and the nation state have changed. First, he suggested, technical-economic functions of the nation state are relocated to other levels of state organization, in what Jessop referred to as de-nationalization of statehood. This aspect is evident in the ways in which state capacities are "reorganized territorially and functionally on subnational, national, supranational and trans-local levels" (p.12), in which there is a transferring of state power upwards, downwards and sideways through decision-making bodies such as NAFTA, the EU and other intergovernmental blocs. Second, the institutional levels of territorial organization may be shared through various stakeholders in the shift to governance. Third, Jessop recognized that the influence of globalization changes the ways in which the fields of action for national, regional and local actors have been "expanded to include an extensive range of extra-territorial or transnational factors and processes" (p. 16) through the internationalization of policy regime as all levels of spatial distinctions are involved in the dialectic relationships, commonly reflected in

terminologies such as glocalization. Though critical of this terminology, the dialectic dynamic is one that Jessop ascribed to in his own methodological approaches to governance (see Jessop 2000; 2004).

In describing a strategic-relational approach to the study of governance, accounting for a cultural political economy approach to governance studies, Jessop (2000; 2004) argued that scholars ought to examine structure and action in a relational dynamic, rather than as theoretically separated or isolated aspects. Stemming from an institutional approach, Jessop (2004) conceptualized the state as "a relatively unified ensemble of socially embedded, socially regularized, and strategically selective institutions, organizations, social forces and activities organized around (or at least involved in) making collectively binding decisions for an imagined political community" (p. 49). In doing so, he recognized a social component to the state and reinforced the standpoint that the state is a product of social relations. Further to this point, he contended that power in governance practices should be traced as a series of circulations that are embedded in complex social relations both within and beyond the state. Assigning power to individual charismatic leaders serves to "simplify political realities and promise to resolve them….hid[ing] complex, if not chaotic, behind-the-scenes practices" (p. 51). In this approach, the power of the state is not dismissed through the complexities of multi-scalar governance, rather power is seen as relational and consequently equal attention is given to structural and strategic features of governance. It should be noted that Jessop is deeply critical of simplistic notions of multi-level governance and policy networks, one reason being their failure to acknowledge the complexities of heterogeneous patterns of governance within state structures itself. He

argued what is often conceived of as a new way of governance may, in fact, be a re-scaling of the state or an expansion of the state's activities and control to other areas.

Considering the role of international organizations in educational policymaking, Dale and Robertson (2007b) suggested avoiding fruitless discussions about whether international organizations are cause or effect and to rather "context discussions of how their operations and effects vary across different locations" (p. 219). While the sharing of educational policymaking powers with other actors, further complicated by the prevalence of systems of comparison and internationally set goals (i.e. Bologna Process), suggests a likely homogeneity among states (Weymann, Martens, Rusconi & Leuze, 2007), the specifics of nation state responses to such development may depend "on their national transformation capacities, such as the institutional set-up and national ideational paths" (p. 239) and require further research. I suggest that adopting the position that policymaking occurs through interactions between multi-scalar interactions means that we must account for local actors as well, those embedded in local spaces of educational institutions. There is agreement among global governance scholars that the effects of globalization on educational policy processes have resulted in reforms being constructed through multi-scalar interactions of ideas (Campbell, 2004; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Dale & Robertson, 2009). Such analysis suggests educational researchers pay attention to the relational aspects of policymaking in the interactions between actors. The notion of policy networks has emerged in addressing this policy research concern.

Policy Networks

Following from the literature on the shift towards governance in policymaking, the notion of policy networks has emerged as a central concept to understanding how

different actors interact with the state. Policy networks are "sets of formal institutional and informal linkages between governmental and other actors structured around shared if endlessly negotiated beliefs and interests in public policy making and implementation" (Rhodes, 2006, p. 426), considered more loosely coupled arrangements (Rhodes, 1997). Rizvi & Lingard (2010) argued that in the context of globalization, policy networks have become stretched out globally and include private-sector actors. Power and function are "organized in the space of flows" (Castells, 2000, p. 458), showing the move from hierarchy to more horizontal networked relationships offering somewhat decentralized power.

Atkinson and Coleman (1992) conceptualized a distinction between policy networks and policy communities, two points of disputed and unsettled terms of reference that are often used in discussions of networked relations in patterns of governance. They drew upon Benson (1982) to illustrate that the notion of policy network has been used by political scientists to "refer to the dependency relationships that emerge between both organizations and individuals who are in frequent contact with one another in particular policy areas" (Atkinson & Coleman, 1992, p. 157). However, the notion of policy community, they argued, stems from anthropological fields, characterized by a shared framework and belief system for decision-making.

Policy network analysis provides insight to policy development by examining networks of actors concerned with a given policy problem across the public and private sectors and throughout different levels of governance (Mikkelsen, 2006). The focus on concepts of policy networks and communities have refocused the attention on the interactions between political actors, inviting researchers to map relations. Structural

approaches to policy networks (Coleman & Skogstad, 1990) focus on the patterns of relations between actors, illustrating the interactions that are often considered as distinct from the ideas or beliefs that actors hold (Pal, 2010). Yet, such maps, Atkinson and Coleman (1992) argued, fail at providing sophisticated attention to the content of relationships. Other approaches, such as those based on rational choice models, conceptualized network actors' communication channels "for the exchange of information, expertise, trust and other policy resources" (Kenis & Schneider, 1991, p.41), building the logic of the particular policy networks and through careful analysis to understand this logic, rational choice scholars argued, insight to the ways of the working of the network can be gained.

Others emphasized the flow of ideas and people, conceiving of networks as both social structures and relational processes (Ball & Exley, 2010). Marsh and Smith (2000) probed for a deeper understanding of the nature of the relationships in policy networks, through their *dialectical approach*. In this analytical frame, policy networks are understood as embedded in relationships between both structure and agency. A dialectical approach to understanding policy context requires:

- An appreciation of the way formation of the network is affected by a combination of external factors and the decisions of agents;
- An acknowledgement that policy outcomes are the product of the interaction between agents and structures, not merely the sum of the effects of structures and agents;
- The recognition that change in the network is the product of an interaction between context and networks;

- An appreciation that outcomes affect the network. (p. 11)

Inherent in the policy network approach is an assumption of the social dimension to knowledge, whereby reality is a construction that takes place between actors (Guba, 1990) and that policy knowledge is constructed in the interactions between actors (Vidovich, 2007). Hajer and Wagenaar (2003) argued that, conceptually, policy networks exist in an institutional void with little formalized rules of interaction.

> Initially, there are no pre-given rules that determine who is responsible, who has authority over whom, what sort of accountability is to be expected. Yet as politics takes place between organizations, all people bring their own institutional expectations and routines with them. (p. 9)

Consequently, the task of policy analysis of relationships in the context of policy networks is a political one. Interactions between actors "do not stop with how politics is conducted. They reshape what politics and policymaking are about" (Hajer & Wagenaar, 2003, p. 2). Critiques of policy network approaches to studying policy contend that the network concept can act to reify policy processes. Dale and Roberson (2007a) cautioned that new metaphors of *network* or *cluster* are being used to drive particular forms of change in educational governance and careful examination of the ways in which the opening up of spaces for new actors needs to move beyond assumptions of what this might mean in terms of changes for national and supranational engagements, but also for the ways in which educational practices, policies and paradigms are shifting within the nation state itself. They warned such shifts bring about changes outside of existing regulatory spaces, creating institutional forms that are radically different from how education is currently conceived, as evidenced through the rapid expansion of private-public partnerships as one example.

Additionally, others raised issues that networks needs to be better studied and examined. Ball and Exley (2010) argued a necessity to develop insight to how networks actually work in policymaking and argued that qualitative data is needed in this area to further develop our understandings. More particularly in the Canadian context, Skogstad (2006) pointed out that specific research is needed to examine policy networks in the context of multi-level governance and internationalization. The Canadian system of federalism, she offered, has been a barrier to policy analysis extending examinations into the role of the supra-national and sub-provincial levels of networked policymaking and decision-making.

Internationalization

Distinctions between globalization and internationalization are necessary in conceptualizing the policy processes in educational governance. The distinction drawn by Altbach and Knight (2007) is useful here. Globalization can be seen as "the economic, political and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward great international involvement" (p. 290). However, they argued internationalization involves the policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions – and even individuals – to cope with the globalized academic environment. These policies and practices may be motivated by commercial advantage, knowledge mobility, language acquisition, internationalization of curriculum, and in the context of education, often involve initiatives such as branch campuses, cross-border collaborative arrangements, international student programming, English language programs and degrees (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

Internationalization of the university is not a new concept. In fact, universities have always been involved in the global exchange and production of knowledge through research and scholarship (Altbach, 1998). However, current processes of globalization act as economic, political, and societal forces that propel higher education towards significantly greater international involvement (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Increasing convergence and interdependence between nation-states and regional partners in higher education means "basic social arrangements within and around the university become disembedded from their national context due to the intensification of transnational flows of people, information and resources" (Beerkens, 2004, p. 24).

The increasing volume, scope and complexity of international activities at universities are supported by the significant investment of capital to produce both knowledge and skilled individuals for global economic growth (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Contemporary analyses of the knowledge economy recognize knowledge as both global and networked, thereby, enhancing its capacity for productivity and power on a monumental scale (Castells, 2000). Consequently, the role of higher education in building the knowledge economy has moved to the top of the political agenda across nation states and regional bodies of governance (Hartmann, 2004). Furthermore, Marginson (2009) suggested that with the opening up of both national education systems as a whole or individual higher education institutions themselves, "'the notions of 'internationalization' and 'international competitiveness' can… function as ice-breakers to stimulate policies and reforms on the national level" (Enders & de Weert, 2004, p. 146, as cited in Marginson, 2009). Consequently, Marginson argued, once the "global genie has been released" (p. 30), shifts in policy sensibilities, practices and players cannot be predicted,

though are certain to occur with current stable territories of educational and other sectoral governance.

Other scholars are critical of internationalization processes emerging through globalized policy spaces, emphasizing the necessity to locate such processes in historical global relations of colonialism and patriarchy. Abdi (2012) called for a serious interrogation of dominant philosophical traditions for their explicit erasure of multiple African indigenous epistemology and knowledge systems. Arguing that, true to its philosophical roots, philosophy of education should take into account "all locations of formal and informal platforms of learning" (p. 131), yet through continuing colonization, Western mainstream discourses both assume and effectively create contexts whereby the legitimacy of whole continents of people's philosophical capacities are nullified and seen as absent. Furthermore, Abdi critiqued postcolonial assumptions that neglect to historically situate contemporary globalization processes in the practices and epistemologies of colonization, that is, the continuing colonial systems of education. Abdi emphasized the relevance of counter-hegemonic analyses that both historically locate the false claims about African spaces of learning and development and reconstitute the epistemic contributions of African indigenous peoples into the global knowledge systems. Such criticisms are particularly relevant to critique the dominance of Western knowledges that are privileged in both the processes of internationalization processes and the studies that focus on neutral descriptions of such practices.

Shultz (2012) argued that the call for harmonization of policies across the globe ought to raise concerns for the neoliberalization of social justice in ways that perpetuate the privileging of a global elite "by the rules of colonialism, patriarchy and capitalism"

(p. 37). In the context of the spread of UNESCO's *Education for All* (EFA) policies, Shultz emphasized how such global policy processes are destructively effective at positioning social justice as an overall aim of policies that, in contradiction to socially just practices, essentially demolish the democratization of knowledge and public spaces. She called for educational policies and processes that "resist the kinds of passive equality and obedient citizenship where justice is decided and provided by institutions rather than an active equality" (p. 40) of public deliberation that engage multiple knowledge systems. Shultz's critique of EFA policies is important in illustrating how normative claims of social justice are represented through dominant neoliberal discourses, and that theoretical positions which interrogate questions of who is included and what is represented as knowledge in policy agendas focus attention on how power relations are negotiated and maintained in seemingly just policies that aim to connect practices and policies in various global locations. Furthermore, the critique offered by both Abdi (2012) and Shultz remind us that policy knowledge is not disconnected from policy processes, meaning that the knowledge portrayed in international policies deserves critique because of the power such knowledge holds to determine practices that affect the daily lives of people across the global in detrimental ways.

Internationalization in Canadian Higher Education

The Canadian higher education context presents an anomaly in higher education fields in that, unlike other federal systems, there is no formalized national governing body for higher education in Canada. Responsibility for education remains the purview of provincial jurisdiction. The absence of a federal ministry means the federal government approach to internationalization has been fragmented since several different government

departments and units hold authority for a range of policy areas that intersect with the higher education sector (Jones, 209). Several nationally situated organizations have responded to international policy trends efforts to maintain Canada's position in the global knowledge economy.

The mission of the federal government department of Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC*)* commits to building a stronger and more competitive Canada through many funding opportunities for academic mobility programs. The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) connects to post-secondary sectors through its international scholarship programs, international marketing initiatives and the Canadian Studies abroad initiatives. The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) and the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) are both membership organizations that work with educational institutions, including universities, to develop strategies and policies that address governance issues in education. AUCC membership consists of a variety of university presidents across Canada. AUCC publishes several documents, working papers, and reports regarding the activities of Canadian universities around internationalization. Additionally, AUCC hosts conferences and member meetings focused on highlighting initiatives of internationalization, awarding excellent initiatives and providing forums for strategic planning and idea sharing (AUCC, 2007). Higher education is represented on CMEC by Ministers of Education responsible for higher education in each province. CMEC's branch of the Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials deals with quality assurance and qualifications framework production. Also, the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE), a member organization of over 250

universities and colleges in Canada, focuses on advocacy and policy development, including international scholarships and funding opportunities.

In the context of Alberta, the provincial governmental ministry of Advanced Education and Technology holds responsibility for legislation and direct governance of higher education policies. The ministry's work involves three areas of governance: apprenticeship and industry training, adult education and technology. In 2009, the ministry released the *International Education Framework,* aimed at "advancing Alberta's position in the global marketplace and in achieving a knowledge-driven future" (Government of Alberta, 2009, p. 2).

While internationalization has been embraced by Canadian universities (Beck, 2009; Weber, 2004), there has been relatively little examination of how these trends are playing out in Canadian higher educational institutional contexts. Individual institutions have largely taken the lead (Jones, 2009) in various bi-lateral agreements with mechanism focused on internationalizing the curriculum, materializing study abroad practicum experiences for Canadian students, attracting top researchers, and recruiting international students. However, the policy terrain is not thoroughly interrogated in the Canadian scholarly literature (Shubert, Jones & Trilokekar, 2009). More thorough research is needed to understand the ways in which policy knowledge is constructed through various actors in Canadian higher education (Jones, 2009) and this research attempts to address this gap.

Conceptualizing Policy Analysis for the Study of Global Governance

How should we study policy in this changing paradigm of policymaking? Some discussion of the study of policy processes is needed. Interpretive policy analysis models

have emerged to recognize complex systems, in opposition to traditional models of analysis that dominated public policy scholarship (Hajer & Wagenaar, 2003). Technocratic policy analysis aims "to identify cause and effect relationships that can be manipulated by public policy under central and coordinated control" (Dryzek, 2006, p. 190). Steeped in a positivist paradigm, such forms of policy analysis are concerned with causal impacts of policy (Dryzek, 2006) and assume a position of "decisionism" (Majone, 1989) that implicates the policymaker as elite and omniscient. As a dominant form of policy analysis, such pragmatic models presuppose a "straight-forward, matter-of-fact observation [to] provide ready access to an objective world where meaning is not a problem" (Yanow, 1995, p. 111) and ignore the power of policy in creating circumstances that shape particular goals or outcomes (Ball, 1994).

Research and policy analysis from a positivist paradigm have been challenged by hermeneutics, phenomenology, social construction, critical theory and discourse analysis approaches to policy analysis positioned under the heading of "postpositivism" (Dryzek, 2006; Yanow, 1995; Shore & Wright, 2011). While each of these terms pertain to specific methodological perspectives, Yanow illuminated their shared assumption that "meaning is not something that can be taken for granted – that the creation, communication, and understanding of meaning require attention" (Yanow, 1995, p. 111) in policy processes. Grounding her policy work in interpretive policy analysis, Yanow focused on the importance of meaning to understanding policy processes, underpinned by the belief that "meaning resides not in any one of these – not exclusively in the author's intent, in the text itself or in the reader alone – but is, rather, created actively in the interactions among all three, in the writing and in the reading" (Yanow, 2000, p. 17).

Interpretive policy analysis challenges the pragmatic, technocratic conceptualization of policy for its inability to recognize the importance of meaning in policy design, implementation and evaluation, rendering it more democratic (Dryzek, 1990). As Yanow (2011) stated, "policies as social change mechanisms is [sic] a baseline assumption among policy analysts" (p. 304) in postpositive approaches to policy analysis.

Other models of policy analysis challenge positivist framings of policy as predictable and rational processes by focusing on policy as a lens through which to study processes of political transformation occurring in "a social and political space articulated through relations of power and systems of governance" (Shore & Wright, 1997, p. 14). Such analyses see policy as produced through processes of contestation across a political space (Wright & Reinhold, 2011).

The descriptive and analytical framework developed by Brock, McGee & Gaventa (2004) focused on understanding the intersections of knowledge, actors, and spaces involved in policy processes, moving away from traditional, technocratic understandings that aim "to identify cause and effect relationships that can be manipulated by public policy under central and coordinated control" (Dryzek, 2006, p. 290). Brock, McGee and Gaventa argued that actors, knowledge and policy spaces interact in complex processes in the "making and doing of policy" (McGee, 2004, p. 25). Policy processes are imbued with historical, cultural and political significance that involves ambiguous but powerful relations which "shape all aspects of the context, the policy spaces themselves and the way actors and knowledge interrelate in them" (p. 23). Policy actors comprise the multitude of individuals, organizations, and institutions across "the vertical slice" (Brock, McGee & Gaventa, 2004) of governance, business sectors and

civil society. The vertical slice allows the researcher to examine those actors with interest in policymaking, implementation and evaluation across various levels of international, national and local levels of government. In considering policy actors, the analysis is grounded in the tenet that actors are agents of policy since "actors hold opinions and interests; they are embedded in institutional and political cultures; they exercise agency" (McGee, 2004, p. 9).

In this framework, the concept of knowledge is approached as the types and sorts of information on which policies are constructed, interpreted into processes of implementation and evaluated (Brock, McGee & Gaventa, 2004). While technocratic analyses often consider knowledge to be institutionally produced as neutral and objective, this approach conceptualizes knowledge created in policy processes as laden with ideological baggage (McGee & Brock, 2001). Knowledge is constructed through discourses and narratives that "are constructed and perpetuated through the selective use of knowledge, and also foster the production and construction of particular sorts of knowledge, in a logic of self-perpetuation and self-reinforcement" (McGee, 2004, p. 13). Information and experience that actors bring into policy processes constitute knowledge through their interests so that knowledge determines legitimacy (Olssen, 2004) in policy. By challenging the frames through which legitimacy of knowledge is framed, power dynamics can be shifted and rendered more democratic (Dryzek, 1990). In exploring knowledge, analysis involves identifying sources of knowledge and how it is constructed within discourse around policy.

Finally, Brock, McGee and Gaventa (2004) draw upon the work of Grindle and Thomas (1991) to define space as particular moments in which intervention or events

offer new opportunities, "reconfiguring relationships between actors or bringing in new ones, and opening up the possibilities of a shift in direction" (p. 22). Policy spaces may be described as closed, invited, or autonomous and the analysis involves questioning, "Who occupies spaces and why?"

Shore and Wright (2011) acknowledged the influence of policy analysts' work that draws upon Foucauldian notions of *dispositif* to conceptualize policy processes being produced in an "ensemble of practices, institutions, architectural arrangements, regulations, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical propositions and morality that frame a disciplinary space" (Shore & Wright, 2011, p. 11). In the field of educational policy studies, Gale (2001) utilized Foucault's approaches of archaeology and genealogy to develop three historical lenses for critical policy research: policy historiography, policy archaeology, and policy genealogy. Other scholars drawing upon Foucauldian analysis, such as Olssen, Codd and O'Neill (2004), criticized Gale's contributions, insisting that his approach made problematic distinctions between historiography and genealogy and failed to adequately define what is *critical* in this approach.

Seeking to acknowledge the connections between global, national and local discourses, Goldberg (2006) extended Gale's work and used Foucault's conceptualization of discursive practices to develop the metaphor of the discursive web to further probe into policy processes. She sought to show how particular discourses, in this case, those centered on "brain drain" in professional and trade policies in Ontario, are connected to discourses of globalization, neo-liberal capitalism and notions of skills-shortages in the province and in the larger systems of the global skilled workforce. Goldberg's notion of

the discursive web highlighted how the discursive context is a social construction of multiple and conflicting discourses. Furthermore, she sought to illustrate, in this particular study, that the state is only one of many discursive players in policy processes, albeit, a major stakeholder and powerful actor.

Also drawing upon Foucault's concepts of discourse and performativities, Ball (2001) addressed policy paradigm convergence as "the invocation of policies with common underlying principles, technologies, similar operational mechanisms and similar first and second order effects" rather than a simplistic notion of convergence, where the same policies are being implemented in very different national contexts.

> First, at the micro-level, across different nation states, new policy technologies are producing new forms of discipline (new working practices and worker subjectivities) and second, at the macro-level, across different nation states, these disciplines provide one basis for a new 'settlement' between state and capital and new modes of social regulation, operating across state and private organisations. While, clearly, the pace, degree of intensity and hybridity of the deployment of these new policy technologies varies. They are typically part of a loose policy ensemble, parts of which are emphasised and enacted somewhat differently, in different vernaculars, in different locations and as Elmore (1996) points out policy is always additive, layered and filtered. (Ball, 2001, p. xxxi)

Additionally, Bourdieu's notion of *habitus* has been used to show how policy actors come to internalize, embody and become habituated to structuring frameworks. Naidoo (2004) drew upon Bourdieu's field theory to conceptualize the field of higher education as traditionally pertaining to a relatively high degree of autonomy, "in that it generates its own values and behaviour imperatives that are relatively independent from forces emerging from the economic and political fields" (p. 458). However, he identified

that higher education is "in fact not a product of total consensus, but the product of a permanent conflict" (p. 459) as fields are relational and dynamic, contingent and constantly changing with actors engaged in struggles over legitimacy (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Yet, Shore and Wright (2011) called attention to the fact that accounts drawing upon Foucault or Bourdieu do not aim to focus attention on the "how" of policy, how the elements that come together in an assemblage or apparatus work together to produce policy. Shore and Wright argued that it is precisely here that policy studies need to focus, positing, "from our perspective, it is precisely the way that policy creates links between agents, institutions, technologies and discourses and brings all of these diverse elements into alignment that makes it analytically productive" (Shore & Wright, 2011, p. 11). They argued for conceiving of policies as

> actants that have agency and that change as they enter into relations with actors, objects and institutions in new domains. The challenge is to study policies as they develop and as they are enacted in everyday practice….it calls for an idea of policies as 'assemblages' rather than discrete 'thing'. (Shore & Wright, 2011, p. 20)

Policy Studies in Globalizing Policy Spaces

Rizvi and Lingard (2010) drew attention to how politics in the era of the globalizing policy field involves constant negotiation of values and authority. While they theorized a global convergence of values, they contended that such convergence is not a stable entity driven by one particular agential source. Rather, they argued the notion of assemblage is particularly valuable in global policy analysis to show "that there are no discrete values accorded privilege, but rather a messy shifting entity comprised of

ongoing material and political practices that establish a precarious values consensus of the moment" (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, p. 134-135). Policy studies should aim to discover how particular values and authorities are assembled and what politics are in play to ensure their stability. Given such an approach, Rizvi and Lingard focused attention on seeing the complex workings that present themselves not as a stable entity but rather the minutia of interactions and renegotiations that bring about and serve to present stable convergences of policy.

Traditionally, the study of multi-scalar policy processes has been viewed through a linearity and, consequently, a partitioning of practices – policymaking focused on one level of the policy process: national policy initiatives, local organizational issues, or international organizations. However, some scholars focused on backward mapping (Dyer, 1999; Elmore, 1979) to look at how particular initiatives have been taken up at local spaces as a policy is followed from site of implementation to site of policy design. For example, utilizing a case study of educational policy implementation in India, Dyer (1999) detailed the findings from her observations and interviews with local, regional, and national levels of stakeholders to investigate policy processes. As a backward mapping approach, her study began at the site of implementation and she reported that local knowledge of teachers was not utilized in policy design and there was little ownership of the policy process by all levels of stakeholders. In conclusion, she argued for transparency and increased research attention for policy implementation processes. Dyer's study, however, focused on backward mapping as an effective approach to both developing and analyzing policy to ensure better alignment between policy intention and implementation and did not consider the relationships between the actors at various scalar

levels nor the ways in which policy is translated, understood and enacted into practice through such relationships. In this sense, her approach to the study of policy was not relational.

However, Resnick (2006) adopted a more relational approach to her study that examined OECD, World Bank and UNESCO policies to trace the education-economic-growth network. Resnick drew upon Actor-Network Theory to problematize neo-institutional theories of knowledge transmission and diffusion. She argued that these supra-national organizations became actors actively engaged in the co-production of the 'world education culture'. A key focus for Resnick was to reject the notion of the lone powerful actor in educational policy arenas to illustrate how power is exercised through the constant efforts at re-alignment and translation of policy knowledge between these actors.

Recently, the work of Ball, Maguire, Braun and Hoskins (2011a) sought to address the ways in which local policy actors enact various policies in their daily work, by invoking the notion of enactment to the study of secondary school policies. Departing at the premise that "policies do not normally tell you what to do, they create circumstances in which the range of options available in deciding what to do are narrowed or changed, or particular goals or outcomes are set" (Ball, 1994, p. 19), the authors challenged functionalist assumptions of linear policy processes by arguing that putting policies into practice requires creative, complex and contentious acts of enactment. In their broad study of four secondary schools in England, the scholars aim to show how policies are enacted as assemblages of various national and local initiatives in secondary schools. The concept of enactment is key to this study and requires a "dense

definition" (p. 11) of policy and policy processes as a composite of " (1) regulation and imperatives, (2) principles and (3) multi-level and collective efforts of interpretation and translation (creative enactment)" (p. 11). In this study, the authors sought to explain how policy enactment requires the localization and customization in processes of interpretation and translation, where "translation is a process of continuous displacement, transformation and negotiation" (Herbert-Cheshire, 2003, p. 461, as cited in Ball, Maguire, Braun & Hoskins, 2011a, p. 11) through various discursive and material practices. In this way, policy processes involve interactions between diverse and shifting networks of "actors/participants" (p. 11) as policy itself becomes transformed in its interaction with many actors seeking to achieve their own goals (Latour, 1986).

Key to the conceptual framework developed by Ball, Maguire, Braun and Hoskins (2011b) is the notion that enactment involves creative processes of interpretation (decoding policy) and translation (recoding policy into practice). Interpretation is "an initial reading, a making sense of policy" (p. 619). Yet, their analysis distinguishes the centrality of the notion of translation in policy processes, whereby translation is "an iterative process of making texts and putting those texts into action, literally 'enacting' policy" (p. 620). Referencing actor-network theory (Braun, Ball, Maguire & Hoskins, 2011b), the saliency of the notion of translation is in describing how policies enactments engage with other policy initiatives and local values as they are "translated" into action in particular contexts. There is significant value in how the authors brought the notion of enactment to the fore of the study of policy processes, and how the use of this concept allows them to both conceptualize the messy intersection of various policy initiatives and to describe how such interactions play out in real-life contexts and practices.

Actor-Network Theory in Policy Studies

Approaches that draw upon Actor-Network Theory (ANT) in policy studies share similar aims as in critical and interpretive policy analysis to challenge technocratic views of policy processes for their reliance on a rationalist view of actors and their interactions. ANT privileges the relational, so that its significance in policy studies is that scholars seek to identify the ways in which policy processes bring together, that is, *assemble*, particular actors, ideas, institution, texts and objects in the governance of institutions and, in this case, higher education governance related to internationalization policies. ANT traces how all things become assembled, whereby the notion of things involves the "natural, social, technical, or more accurately, the messy mix of these" (Fenwick, Edwards & Sawchuk, 2011, p. 94).

The term actor-network was first developed by Michel Callon in Paris between 1978 and 1982 (Law, 2009), though John Law pointed out that the approach itself is broad and could be considered itself a network, spread over time and place. Seminal ANT scholars are situated in diverse fields such as sociology (Latour 1999a; 2005), sociology of organizations (Law, 1999; 2003; 2009) and public health policy (Mol, 1999). Recently, Fenwick and Edwards (2010) raised the issue of the relevance of ANT to the study of educational policies, conducting rather large and significant reviews of what they deemed ANT and ANT-ish studies. Scholars such as Nespor (2002; 2003; 2010) have used ANT in studying the scale of educational practices and curriculum reform.

Law (2009) characterized actor-network theory as a "disparate family of material-semiotic tools, sensibilities, and methods of analysis" (Law, 2009), specifically stipulating that ANT is not a theory. In fact, both Law and Latour (1999a; 199b) asserted

a certain mistake in the naming of ANT was the use of the word theory. Law offered that ANT's propensity towards analyses that *describe*, rather than *explain*, suggest it is not a theory, stating, "instead it tells stories about 'how' relations assemble or don't….it is better understood as a toolkit for telling interesting stories about, and interfering in, those relations" (p. 142).

A key concept in ANT is the conceptualization of the actor-network. Cordella and Shaikh (2006) succinctly noted the point of ANT studies "move[s] the focus of the analysis from the actor…towards a more complex and less defined phenomenon that is the interaction" (p. 9). An actor, in ANT, is anything that acts or to which agency is granted or produced by others, and is consequently referred to as "actant" (Latour, 1999b). The heterogeneity of actants, as both the human and non-human, is essential to ANT studies. A point to note is the relational aspect of ANT, meaning that actants develop as networks, to associate or disassociate with other actants to form networked associations, "which in turn define them, name them, and provide them with substance, action, intention and subjectivity" (Crawford, 2005, p. 1). Hence the hyphenated term, "actor-network". Latour (1999b) elaborated on the work of the actor-network:

> An actor-network is an entity that *does* the tracing and the inscribing. It is an ontological definition and not a piece of inert matter in the hands of others, especially of human planners or designers. It is in order to point out this essential feature that the word 'actor' was added to it. (p. 5)

Further to this point, Latour (1999b) clarified that the notion of network should not be given a technical meaning, "in the sense of a sewage, or train, or subway, or telephone 'network'" (p. 1) as is common in modern society. Nor, he clarified, does network refer to the notion of a social network found in the study of social relations

between individual actors. Rather, Latour asked us to consider networks in terms of nodes with diverse dimensions and connections, adopting a network-like ontology, rather than a flat two-dimensional surface commonly used in network conceptualizations. Strength in this network-ontology "does not come from concentration, purity and unity, but from dissemination, heterogeneity and the careful plaiting of weak ties" (p. 2). For Latour, there is nothing but networks.

Fenwick (2010b) argued five important contributions of ANT to the study of policy processes, for its focus on: 1) the centrality of artifacts – of which policies are conceptualized as things, materials, policies as a consequence of socio-material relations; 2) reconfiguring how we understand the notion of policy; 3) avoiding *a priori* privileging of particular values or actors as inherently powerful; 4) moving beyond language and ideology to focus on material relations, 5) interrogating the commonly positioned "global-local" distinctions of scale.

I intend to draw upon ANT to address three areas: the notion of assemblage (how things are brought together and assembled in networked relations), enactment (how things are practiced and performed relationally in these networks) and scale (how boundaries signifying distance and location are performed through networked relations).

Assemblage. Actor network theory offers a new way for viewing organizations, moving away from a structural functionalist view of organizations, towards studying practices and processes of organizing (Alcadipani & Hassard, 2010). Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) offered that ANT provides exciting opportunities for scholars concerned with institutional theories because of the focus that takes precedence in its studies:

> how actors and organizations mobilize, juxtapose and hold together the bits and pieces of which they are composed: how they are sometimes able

> to prevent those bits and pieces from following their own inclinations and making off and how they manage, as a result, to conceal for a time the process of translation itself and so turn a network from a heterogeneous set of bits and pieces each with its own inclinations, into something that passes as an actualised actor. (Law, 1992, p. 6).

In this way, that which seems to be static, through ANT, is rather understood to be an assemblage. The concern here is for the way in which things become black-boxed (Latour, 2005), that is, how the actor-network creates stability is deemed invisible.

Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) offered ANT as a fresh perspective to institutional theory through its focus on the struggles and contestations that generate and reproduce institutions. In this case, the stability of institutions should be considered as "relational effects" (Law, 1992), moving the focus away from outcome of institutions such as norm production and instead focuses on the interactions that produce particular outcomes, such as particular policies and relational positioning of actors. Just as Resnick (2006) rejected the notion of policy knowledge diffusion, ANT focuses on "exploring the processes of interaction through which the adoption of similar practices can support and reinforce coalitions and alliances between distinct networks of actants with different objectives or goals" (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 242). In ANT, the focus is on the everyday material practices (Gorus, 2010) that work to combine and align "objects, ideas and behaviours" (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, p. 137). Studying multi-scalar levels of interactions through the lens of ANT requires the researcher to question how things come together to present themselves as stable entities.

Scale. Latour (1999a) articulated the significance of rejecting essentialist *a priori* ordering of the world in ANT studies, meaning ANT research plays with scale (Fenwick, 2010b). For Latour, there is neither a local nor a global scale, only a relational one.

Consequently, he rejected such dualisms of global/local or micro/macro since "big does not mean 'really' big or 'overarching', but connected, blind, local, mediated, related" (p. 18). Level is a relational effect argued Law (2009), so that entities such as class, the nation-state or patriarchy become "effects rather than explanatory foundations" (p. 147). Furthermore, the network notion carries no *a priori* order (Latour, 1999b), meaning that the notions of moving from top to bottom, global to local, macro to micro do not hold. Consequently, ANT is ideally suited to the study of scale (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010), since the researcher may relinquish *a priori* partitioning of the world through scalar divisions and focus on how the features such as hierarchy and vertical scale are achieved.

> Instead of having to choose between the local and the global view, the notion of network allows us to think of a global entity – a highly connected one – which remains nevertheless continuously local…Instead of opposing the individual level to the mass or the agency to the structure, we simply follow how a given element become strategic through the number of connections it commands and how does it lose its importance when losing its connections. (p. 4)

Burgess (2008) used the concept of the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) as an object of inquiry to understand how the relationships between global policy initiatives and local practices are mediated in schools. Drawing on Latour (1993) to argue an ANT perspective that what we often think of as a global policy is always being enacted at local levels, she theorized that the ILP mediates between the levels of global scale policy initiatives, in this case, the Skills for Life program in the UK, and local enactments embodied in classroom practices through the ILP. While Fenwick and Edwards (2010) pointed to the discrepancies in Burgess' approach to ANT, they also concluded that Burgess effectively utilized a policy object in order to show how networks are assembled

between scalar divisions and consequently, how this policy object changed in this process. Burgess argued that the students and teachers become "co-opted as active agents" (p. 49) of the Skills for Life program through their interactions with the ILP documents, and she showed how this interaction worked as a powerful mediator for constructing teacher and learner identities.

As Fenwick and Edwards (2010) stated, when someone says structure, ANT asks how it has been assembled and what are the myriad of things that make such structure possible. In this way, what is deemed as global is not given more or less privilege and power than that which has been considered local. Rather, the ways in which ideas, policies and actors have been arranged in order to present themselves as stable entities is questioned, to find out how it is that particular actors are granted more stability, more power and more influence. Alternately, the actors often deemed as local in trajectory studies are not considered removed, distant and as lacking power and agency. In ANT, all sites are considered local, meaning we enter each site of study as a place where connections are being made, things are being assembled and relations are being enacted as actors go about their mundane daily work (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010; Latour, 2005).

Furthermore, this requires that we study things in their enactments, that is, how they are performed and brought into being through their relations, rather seeing them as given in the order of things (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010). Consequently, this study aims to discover how the relationships between multi-scalar actors in Canadian higher education are developed between actors and the ways in which multi-scalar boundaries are maintained and stabilized in governance practices, by focusing on what actors do.

Enactment. The study of policy enactment is "about examining connections and inter-dependencies" (Braun, Maguire & Ball, 2010, p. 558). As a sociomaterial approach, ANT involves following a policy (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010): both following the interactions of people around policies but also includes what that policy *does* itself. In what ways does a particular policy act? How does it bring together and connect particular actors? What are the effects of this assemblage on ordering the social world of policy governance? The important distinction that ANT offers to policy studies is that the focus of this approach is not on what texts and other objects *mean* specifically, but on what they *do*, as Fenwick, Edwards and Sawchuk (2011) explained in the significance of the actor-network concept: "And what they do is always in connection with other human and non-human things. Some of these connections link together to form an identifiable entity or assemblage, which ANT refers to as an 'actor', that can assert force" (p. 97). These actor-networks become assembled in networks of things that have come to be connected in particular ways and then "the actor itself … can produce fears, policies, pedagogies, forms of play and resistances to these forms – hence, actor-network" (p. 97).

Translation. Translation describes what happens when things connect, both human and non-human things, changing one another and forming links (Latour, 1987). As Fenwick and Edwards (2010) put it, "entities that connect eventually form a chain or network of action and things, and these networks tend to become stable and durable" (p. 9). An important distinction in the notion of translation is a process, "the work of making two things that are not the same, equivalent" (Law, 1999, p. 8). As such, focusing on this process calls attention to the generation of "ordering effects such as devices, agents, institutions or organizations" (Law, 2003, p. 5). While diffusion is used in many

institutional theories to explain the movement of an object through space and time, the notion of translation "emphasizes the changes that occur in meanings and interpretations as a physical or social object moves through a network" (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 67).

Studies using ANT focus on how things become *punctualized*, that is, stable and fixed and to explore the relations in place that perform such stability. For example, Fenwick (2010) shows how standards become punctualized as a list of self-contained, self-evident objects, fixed in time in the form of an object. She argued the messy network(s) that produced the list are invisible, or become black-boxed (Latour, 2005). Furthermore, they are mobile and can be located across space and time to regulate activity, making them *immutable mobiles* (Latour, 2005; Law, 2003), acting as *intermediaries* that transport meaning without acting on it, to change it (Latour, 2005). Punctualised resources "offer a way of drawing quickly on networks of the social without having to deal with endless complexity. And, to the extent that they are embodied in such ordering efforts, they are then performed, reproduced in and ramify through the networks of the social" (Law, 2003, p. 5). Things look as though they are singular, masking the heterogenous actors involved in the network. Callon (1999) explained that such stability is a means of synchronizing meanings among actors through time and space, acting as "'boundary objects' that make possible the framing and stabilisation of actions, while simultaneously providing an opening onto other worlds" (Hamilton, 2011, p. 62).

More recently, the notion of *mediators* (Latour, 2005) has been invoked to describe theorizing of the fluidity and change that occurs through translation. A mediator circulates through the network to "transform, distort and modify the meaning in the

elements" (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, p. 11). Akrich (1992) used this concept to show how a water pump was changed and modified as it interacted in different actors in different communities, when different handles and levers are added to its structure. For ANT, these changes indicate moments of change and fluidity, showing how objects are changed as they interact with other actors. In the context of educational policy studies, the ways in which policies are morphed, shifted and interpreted into practice as they interact with various actors illustrate fluidity, rather than stability of objects.

Law (2003) drew attention to the resistance within entities that appears to be stable. The notion of resistance suggests a fluidity, or struggle, that produces the effect of stability. Such ideas of institutions and other social actors focus on the contingent nature of the social, that it is always in a state of readjustment, and that what appears to be stable is actually produced through the interactions of the network. The task for social sciences, then, is to "characterise these networks in their heterogeneity, and explore how it is that they come to be patterned to generate effects like organisations, inequality and power" (Law, 2003, p. 3). At the core of actor-network theory is a concern for understanding how translation occurs, that is how actors and organizations move, change, shift and hold together the relations in which they are composed.

Translation and power. Power is not seen initially as a cause, but rather an effect, through the processes of translation (Law, 2003). Power is core to ANT studies, highlighted in the focus on "analyzing the exercises of power by which cultural, social and economic capital is produced and reproduced" (Edwards, 2002, p. 355). In this way, ANT is useful at probing the way that politics work to constrain and enable certain enactments (Fenwick, 2010b). Here, power is conceptualized in a post-structuralist view

(Rose, 1999), as it is both productive and constraining, circulating through shifting webs of relations. As Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) clarified, power is "referential and distributed amongst actors in a network" (p. 67). Collective interaction produces power, not individual actions of isolated actors. Focusing on power through networks means focusing on ways in which actor-networks grow in size, complexity and influence through translation. ANT analyses see power in "the social practices and skills needed to mobilize competing frames or interpretations that, in turn, define the resources and actants that comprise the field" (p. 68). As Lawrence & Suddaby pointed out, power is a relational effect of networks; actors appear as powerful because networks of actors produced them as such.

Conclusion

This study that I propose aims to look at policy actors involved higher education governance, not from a linear perspective, but rather I theorize that we can better understand how governance is occurring by tracing the network of actors, both human and non-human, in order to question who works with whom, who holds what position in the network, which networks connect with networks, and who is not connected. Like Resnick (2006), I am concerned with the ways in which power is relational and emerges through interactions between actors, rather than assuming an inherent power to actors' structures and positions. Current theorizing on the contemporary manifestations and institutionalizations of globalization on the arenas of legitimacy and authority in educational governance require recognition for the historical contexts in which policies are produced and enacted. Here, I emphasize the importance of approach that sees power

and agency as the products of a capacity to stabilize networks (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006).

What this study offers to the literature is a look at the ways in which the distinctions between scales are enacted through contemporary practices of policymaking in globalized policy spaces. In this study, my analysis does not start with assumptions that global or local policy spaces exist outside of ways in which they are enacted through policy processes, nor that one space is inherently more powerful than another. Rather, I sought to explore how such power relations are enacted in order to understand governance and how power is both produced through and producing these scalar distinctions.

Chapter Three: Methodology

In this chapter, I begin with a discussion on how ANT informs the ontological and epistemological assumptions on which this dissertation is based, considering my own positionality as a researcher in this qualitative study. Next, I elaborate on the particular methodology and methods through which I propose to conduct this study, drawing together interpretive policy analysis and actor-network theory in a policy ethnography approach to the research. Finally, I devote some considerations to writing and evaluating the research account.

Locating ANT: Discussion of Ontology and Epistemology

Actor-network theory is based on an ontology of relations, a material-semiotic approach that treats "everything in the social and natural worlds as a continuously generated effect of the webs of relations within which they are located. It assumes that nothing has reality or form outside the enactment of those relations" (Law, 2009, p. 141). Appropriately, ANT has been referred to as the sociology of associations (Latour, 1999b) or sociology of translations (Law, 2003). Sociology of translations, contended Law, is inherently concerned with the mechanics of power:

> How some kinds of interactions more or less succeed in stabilising and reproducing themselves: how it is that they overcome resistance and seem to become 'macrosocial'; how it is they seem to generate the effects of such power, fame, size scope or organisation which we are all familiar…how, in other words, size, power or organisation are generated. (p. 2)

Law and Urry (2003) stressed that ANT deals with both ontology (the theory of what is real) and epistemology (the theory of knowledge) relationally, stipulating, "the move here

is to say that real is a relational effect" (p. 5). The authors elaborated ANT's position of the real by stating, "the 'real' is indeed *real*, it is *also* made and that it is made within relations" (p. 5.) In doing so, these scholars, as do other ANT scholars such as Latour (2005) and Mol (1999), argued that neither relativist nor realist positions reflect the ontological position of actor-network theory.

> This means we are *not* saying that reality is arbitrary. The argument is neither relativist nor realist. Instead it is that the real is produced in thoroughly non-arbitrary ways, in dense and extended sets of relations. It is produced with considerable effort, and it is much easier to produce some realities than others. In sum, we're saying that the world we know in social science is both real and it is produced. (Law & Urry, 2003, p. 5)

Cordella and Shaikh (2006) stipulated that "ANT does not only propose a new way of questioning reality; it also introduces a new way of conceptualising the understanding of reality" (Cordella & Shaikh, 2006, p. 14). A relational ontology suggests that entities *become* through relations, through interactions between actors. Rejecting a realist position, Fenwick (2010b) addressed this issue, stating, "a network in ANT *does not connect things that already exist, but actually configures ontologies"* (p. 119). Furthermore, Law and Urry (2003) succinctly posited, ANT studies require researchers to be aware that the methods of questioning reality do in fact "produce realities as they interact with other kinds of interactions" (p. 5).

An important distinction of the nature of reality in ANT is that "entities achieve their form as a consequence of the relations in which they are located. But this means that it also tells us that they are *performed* in, by, and through those relations" (Law, 1999, p. 4). Fenwick (2010b) described how such performance is the central focus of ANT studies.

> ANT-inspired studies trace the micro-interactions through which diverse elements or 'actants' are performed into being: how they come together – and manage to *hold* together – in 'networks' that can act. These networks produce force and other effects: knowledge, identities, rules, routines, behaviors, new technologies and instruments, regulatory regimes, reforms, illnesses, and so forth. No anterior distinctions such as 'human being' or social 'structure' are recognized – everything is performed into existence. (Fenwick, 2010b, p. 120)

Such focus on the enactment and performance suggests a tension with the constructivist assumptions in interpretivist research (Cordella & Shaikh, 2006; Latour, 2005). Constructivism is based in a relativist ontology, meaning that "realities are apprehendable in the form of multiple, intangible mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature (although elements are often shared among many individuals and even across culture), and dependent for their form and content on the individual persons or groups holding constructions" (Guba & Lincoln, 1998, p. 110). In constructivism, there is not one single reality that exists outside of the knower, but rather that what can be considered reality is that which is constructed in the cognitive, mental processes of the individual. Therefore, in constructivism, there are multiple constructed realities that are not more or less *true* but "simply more or less informed and/or sophisticated" (p. 111).

However, ANT is often portrayed as a constructivist approach to research and even Latour (2005) considered the constructivist nature of ANT. Yet, in doing so, Latour distinguished how the notion of construction is taken up in actor network studies, stipulating that ANT is inherently constructivist as it is grounded in the assumption that what is real is made up of, assembled by, a hetereogeneous network of actors. That is,

constructivist notions "highlight the collective process that ends up as solid constructs through the mobilization of heterogeneous crafts, ingredients and coordination" (Latour, 2003, p. 4). What is real is not made in the human mind but nor does it exist external to other things. However, the relationality of reality in ANT requires that it be constructed.

The problem with constructivism, argued Latour, is the insertion of the "social" as means of reducing what reality is made of to only be the social realm, neglecting to notice the other things of which reality may be constructed. In this sense, Latour articulated a sharp distinction between constructivism and *social* constructivism. ANT aims to see the heterogeneous assemblage, of human and non-human actors, not as a fixed entity often used by critical sociologists to offer stable explanations of how things are really made only of what is deemed as social, but rather as a messy myriad of heterogeneous actants whose very stability could, at any time, fail, and result in other entities. As Latour (2005) stated, "when we say that a fact is constructed, we simply mean that we account for the solid objective reality by mobilizing various entities whose assemblage could fail" (p. 91).

Other scholars have taken up the task of clarifying the ontology offered in ANT. Annemarie Mol (1999), focusing on the ontological politics of ANT, emphasized the possibilities of multiple ontologies. That is, there is not social *order*, but rather social *orders*. She stipulated that the multiple ontologies of ANT are distinct from the pluralist sensibilities of interpretation, in which multiplicity means plural understandings. Rather she insisted that ANT regards plural ontologies of ordering. In her writing on ontological politics, that is, the "way in which the 'real' is implicated in the 'political' and *vice versa"* (p. 74), Mol made the distinction between the notions of pluralist and multiple

realities. The notion of plural realities, such as those viewed in constructivism and perspectivalism, assume pluralist views of the truth while maintaining a single object, or plural possible constructions of one singular object. However, ANT adopts the notion of multiplicity of performance, that is, things are multiple in their performances. This suggests "a reality that is *done* and *enacted* rather than observed. Rather than being seen by a diversity of watching eyes while itself remaining untouched in the centre, reality is manipulated by means of various tools in the course of a diversity of practices" (Mol, 1999, p. 77).

Qualitative Research

This research is positioned as qualitative. Contrary to quantitative research, qualitative inquiries are not concerned with discerning an external reality that exists "out there", objectively for the researcher to identify, name, quantify, or verify through tests. Rather, Patton (1985) drew attention to the ability of qualitative research to address the particular, the uniqueness and the nature of the object of inquiry. In this way, qualitative research is not concerned with verifying hypotheses that can be generalized towards a larger population or context, as is often the focus of quantitative study. Rather, the focus of qualitative research on *understanding* is itself the goal. Patton explains:

> Qualitative research is an effort to understand situations in their uniqueness as part of a particular context and the interactions there. This understanding is an end in itself, so that it is not attempting to predict what may happen in the future necessarily, but to understand the nature of that setting – what it means for participants to be in that setting, what their lives are like, what's going for them, what their meanings are, what the world looks like in that particular setting – and in the analysis to be able to

> communicate that faithfully to others who are interested in that setting . . . . The analysis strives for depth of understanding. (Patton, 1985, p. 1)

Merriam (1998) theorized five characteristics that make qualitative research distinct: a) concern with the emic, the insider's perspectives, the participants' perspectives; b) researcher as primary instrument for data collection and analysis; c) fieldwork as common approach to data collection; d) primarily based on inductive strategies by "building abstraction, concepts, hypotheses or theories" (Merriam, 1998, p. 7); and e) rich descriptions of phenomenon being studied. These characteristics indicate that qualitative research involves multi-method inquiries focused on naturalistic approaches (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). The naturalist approach to research means that the researcher engages in the study of action in contexts that are not contrived or manipulated but rather committed to real contexts (Schwandt, 2001). Such research opposes clinical approaches common in quantitative research that place emphasis on manipulating or fabricating the research context to avoid tainting or contaminating sites. Rather, in qualitative research, the inquiry is focused on understanding how meaning is constructed in the daily, lived experiences and actual social contexts of people.

However, understandings of method and methodology are not singular in qualitative research. The qualitative researcher must employ the method most appropriate to access participants' meaning that they attribute in a particular context. Smith (1991) drew upon Gadamer's argument that it is not possible to establish one correct method in inquiry independently of the inquiry context. Smith explained, "This is because *what* is being investigated itself holds part of the answers concerning *how* it should be investigated" (p. 198). The use of multiple methods, or *triangulation*, reflects the qualitative researcher's commitment in seeking an in-depth understanding of the

phenomenon in question (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Consequently, qualitative research involves a design that is flexible and emergent, responding to the contextual changing conditions of the study as time progresses.

The practice of using multiple methodologies of qualitative research may be viewed as bricolage, and the researcher as bricoleur (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). The notion of researcher as *bricoleur* assumes that a set of research tools are not set in advance but rather requires the researcher to be thoughtful about a choice of tools of inquiry, that is, strategies, methods or empirical materials (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). This choice means the researcher must be considerate and deliberate about how to best or most appropriately engage in inquiry, reflecting on the questions being asked and the situational context of the research. For example, observation of policymakers in their interactions with others will provide contextual information related to how the relationships between actors play out in everyday interactions while interviews will provide insight to how actors think about and understand their interactions and relationships with others. Additionally, the researcher-as-*bricoleur*-theorist is able to construct inquiries that can be positioned "between and within competing and overlapping perspectives and paradigms" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 3), or in the case of ANT research, multiple ontologies. In this context, the researchers must be able to think broadly about what approach, strategy or method is most appropriate and to adapt and interconnect the tools of inquiry throughout the research process.

Finally, the *bricoleur* understands that his/her personal history, biography, gender, social class, race, and ethnicity, and those of the people in the setting, interact with the researcher and influence his/her own understandings (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 3).

The researcher-as-*bricoleur* does not attempt to objectify or remove his/her own pre-understandings, but rather is aware of the ways in which his/her own cultural, social and political positioning influences and affects the ways in which he/she understands experiences. In the end, the product of the *bricoleur's* labour is a bricolage, "a complex, dense, reflexive, collagelike creation that represents the researcher's images, understandings, and interpretations of the world or phenomenon under analysis" (p. 3). Yet, these interpretations are not removed from the social world in which they were constructed, and should be read in the very context from which they emerge.

The Positioning of the Researcher

Qualitative researchers are committed to engaging in research that results in rich descriptions of the social world (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994) with a goal of trying to understand the "processes by which people construct meaning and to describe what those meanings are" (p. 49). Therefore, a key concern is to understand from the perspective of the participants, the emic, or insider's perspective (Merriam, 1998), and to develop rich descriptions and understanding through data collection and analysis of fieldwork. In the end, my role is to, first, understand so that I can then develop accounts for others to engage with in order to develop insights. In the context of this research, such meanings are interrogated through their enactments, how actors perform and produce social order.

In this qualitative research, there is a key role for me to identify the complexity of situations, including the ways in which my own experiences and pre-understandings, that is, subjectivities, influence the research (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). However, ANT takes this notion further to insist that I consider my own positioning throughout the research process, as another actor in the network that is being studied (Law & Urry, 2003). That is,

not only do I need to be aware of my own positioning before the research process, but also understand how such positioning is translated through the data gathering, analysis and account writing process (Law, 2007). If all is effect of the network, then so, too, are the researcher and the account that is performed into being. Accounts in ANT are messy and their enactment is not easily done (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010; Law, 2007) and the problem is to represent the mess so that it is not easily undone, unwritten. Much attention must be given to the complexity, the mess of the network, without flattening and neglecting the order and disorder that is constantly negotiated in the assemblage of actors.

At this time, I want to speak briefly about my own positioning in this research. My professional background as a female white, middle-class teacher and school administrator plays a significant role in my valuing of process in education. The relationships between teachers, students, support staff, communities, parents and administrative systems have always been central in how I do my work, as both teacher, educational leader, and student. It is this privileging on the focus of relation that brings me to this work.

Yet, I am also aware of how my privilege has granted opportunities for me to gain social and cultural capital to enter into higher education, to pursue a teaching degree, to mobilize in opportunities to teach internationally, and to sustain extended graduate education. Indeed, the privileging of elite Western education enables my mobility and ability to pursue continuing higher education and attending graduate courses enables a personal interrogation and struggle with how to reconcile the power of both privilege and responsibility afforded to me as an educator.

The accounts produced through ANT approaches are inherently critical. They are focused on explaining how order is produced, how things are assembled and the effects of such assemblages on our social world. As previously stated, the concern is for what is included and excluded in such order. The significance of such research is that if we understand reality as being assembled, then we can seek for ways to re-assemble it when such realities play out to produce inequity and injustice. At the end of the research, our descriptions should enable us to question the significance of what we have produced. This is the ultimate goal of my work in this research project.

Assembling Interpretive Policy Analysis and Actor Network Theory as Methodology

Arguing for an ethnographic sensibility to interpretive policy analysis, Shore and Wright (2011) recognized policies as *assemblages*, that is, "actants that have agency and that change as they enter into relations with actors, objects and institutions in new domains. The challenge is to study policies as they develop and as they are enacted in everyday practices" (p. 20). Further, they argue, is the need to study how enactments of governance come into existence. Yanow (2011) supported this approach to policy studies and advocated for studying across policies and policy actors in "a network fashion" (p. 307) to question, "what work is a policy doing" (p. 305). Quoting Shore (2011), Yanow pointed out that "what following a policy and policy-relevant actors, objects, acts and language achieves [is] 'teasing out connections and observing how policies bring together individuals, discourses and institutions …and the new kinds of networks, relations and subjects this processes creates'" (p. 307). Yanow advocated for policy or political ethnography as a means to study the political in everyday life.

Yanow (2011) conceptualizes policy ethnography as an approach to studying policy processes through ethnographic methods, locating it within the bounds of interpretive policy analysis. Writing about the use of ethnography in the study of political practices, Wedeen (2009) posited that ethnography allows researchers to gain insight and observe how people's experiences emerge in practices and administrative routines (p. 85). Though she recognized the diversity of epistemological, methodological and political commitments of interpretive scholars, Wedeen identified four characteristics uniting interpretive work in this context: viewing knowledge as being historically situated and wrapped up in power relations, perceiving the world as socially made, eschewing individualist assumptions, and pursuing interests in language and other symbolic systems. Here, Wedeen argued for an approach to studying political processes through research that focuses on meaning as "the economy of signs and symbols in terms of which humans construct, inhabit and experience their social lives (and thus act in and upon the world)" (p. 81-82). That is, she advocated for a focus on phenomena for what they both index and generate (Wedeen, 2009). As Yanow (2011) highlighted, policy ethnographers share a focus on discourse with other interpretive policy analysts, but she emphasized, "acts and physical artifacts are also significant in policy meanings" (p. 306). Such an approach aligns well with ANT's focus on studying what things do and offers a valid approach for tracing the work of policies, that is, how policies assemble, include, exclude and stabilize particular actors in governance processes.

The notion of performative practices is particularly relevant to ethnographic studies of the political world (Wedeen, 2009). That is, "actions performed are intrinsic to, not separate from, daily life. Selves, on this account, do not exist, as if in some authentic

mode, independently of the actions by which they are constituted" (p. 87). Using an example of understanding the performances of democracy, Wedeen distinguished between researchers paying attention to what they know (that children salute a flag or that ballots are counted) and what they need to know (discerning what is being performed through the flag waving or ballot tallying in the specific context in which such actions occur), with the latter being of importance in interpretive ethnographic studies. Consequently, she argued, ethnographic sensibilities allow for studying "the conditions under which specific material and semiotic activities emerge, the contexts within which they find public expression, the consequences they have in the world, and the irregularities they generate in the process of reproduction" (p. 90). It is worth noting that Wedeen explicitly recognized interactions of materiality in daily life, yet she limited the action of practices solely to humans. This is an area where ANT scholars would differ in their research, as ANT scholars theorize agency for objects in the world, and set out to explore how such objects work in assembling other actors.

ANT fits well with an ethnographic sensibility towards data collection. As stated earlier, in *Reassembling the Social,* Latour (2005) adamantly opposes sociological approaches to research that use notions of a society, the social, or forms of social structures as explanation. Rather, Latour offered, the aim of social science research is to examine *how* the social or society is assembled, by looking at how hetereogeneous networks of actors are assembled and how things become associated. For researchers, then, Latour argued, the task is to immerse themselves in exploring five uncertainties: how groups are made, how agencies come to be performed, how objects play a role, how associations are mistaken for matters of fact rather than matters of concern for research,

and the research performance of writing accounts that succinctly describe tracings of the actor-network.

Law (2009) highlighted the research focus of ANT is to "explore and characterize the webs and the practices that carry them…. [describing] the enactment of materially and discursively heterogeneous relations that produce and reshuffle all kinds of actors" (Law, 2009, p. 141). Using an ethnographic approach, the focus is on searching for how things become stable, to understand how stability is constantly negotiated, through processes of translation. Translation occurs because all of the actors in a network are enrolled to shape and transform objects, discourses and interpretations according to their own projects and activities (Latour, 1987). All actors, both human and non-human, act to "sustain and adapt their own discourses" (O'Malley, 1996, p. 316) as policies are actively and continuously reinterpreted and enacted in various settings. Consequently, translation is the enactment of power.

If the "how" of stability is sought, then the means by which durability is negotiated requires attention. Interpretive policy analysis requires attention to how policies emerge and are transported through various sites (Yanow, 2011). In this study, the following of the policy through various multi-scalar actors requires paying specific attention to how policies emerge and change as they move throughout these multi-scalar levels of policymaking and how policy ideas are both made stable and fluid in these processes. Law (2009) proposed three ways in which stability is achieved through the actor-network. First, foundation achieved through *material durability* relies on physical form to hold shapes and relationships. Material durability in organizations, for example, can be achieved through the creation of things such as formalized documents (plans,

letters, memos, tests), policy statements (policy documents, written partnership agreements) and organizational structures (buildings, office configuration, locations of meetings, structures of meeting rooms) and the ways in which materials order interactions.

Second, *strategic durability* includes the broad "ordered patterns of relations" (p. 148) involved in the practices by which systems and connections are made. Law suggested that in paying attention to strategy, the concern should not be only with human intentionality but rather the practices that create durable networks.

Third, *discursive stability* is sought as certain discourses are used to order and structure. By example, Law discussed his ethnographic study of the laboratory, in which his findings suggested four different sets of discourses used by managers to order the organizational arrangements: entrepreneurism, bureaucracy, problem-solving, and charisma were used at different times to produce different, though simultaneous, ordering effects in the lab. Law drew upon Foucauldian notions of discourse to argue each discourse operated "to define conditions of possibility, making some ways of ordering webs of relations easier and others difficult or impossible" (p. 149).

Latour (2005) also suggested three key processes in ANT research. Following the actors is an important first step in ANT studies by searching for "continuous connections leading from one local interaction to other places, times and agencies and through which a local site is *made to do* something" (p. 172). Secondly, Latour (2005) recommended paying attention to how local sites are connected to other local sites, what actors (human and non-human) serve as nodes that connect. Here, it was important to pay attention to what links one site, one location in the network, to another. In this way, the point was

always to view each site as local, not as hierarchical. Latour stated that of course hierarchies exist, but I aimed to identify these by tracing what connected each site and how order was arranged in this connection. In the final step, I looked for understanding what effects are produced through these connections, which actors are produced as powerful, who is included and excluded, and the ways in which power is produced through the assemblages of actors. As Fenwick (2010b) explained, ANT is particularly useful for following relational strategies: "An ANT approach notices how things are invited or excluded, how some linkages work and others don't, and how connections are bolstered to make themselves stable and durable by linking to other networks and things" (Fenwick, 2010b, p. 120). Yet, the key here in ANT is focus on how such connections are performed by actors. Latour (2005) sums up the process well:

> The task of defining and ordering the social should be left up to the actors themselves, not taken up by the analyst. This is why, to regain some sense of order, the best solution is to trace connection *between* any given controversy. (Latour, 2005, p. 23)

The Study Methods

I used an ethnographic sensibility to studying policy (Schatz, 2009a; Wedeen, 2009; Yanow, 2011) for this research, beginning the data collection by following internationalization policies at one Canadian university to trace how policies connected different actors. I used document analysis, observation and interview methods with policymakers working on internationalization policy at various policy levels. While my previous initial research into this topic area helped me to begin to understand who some key actors might be in this research, the point of the research related to the research questions was to understand the relations between actors as they are connected through

internationalization policy, paying attention to how scale is created in the actors' interactions.

Even though interviewing is a central method used by researchers in social science, Mishler (1986) critiqued conventional interviewing methods for focusing on standardization, that is, "on how to ask all respondents the same question and how to analyze their responses with standardized coding systems" (p. 233). Mishler argued this approach to viewing interviewing through the lens of standardization neglects to reveal the problems and language, meaning and context embedded in understanding how interviews work. From this standpoint, Mishler maintained that interviewers often ignore or disregard the comments of respondents that appear to be unrelated to the questions being asked. In this way, the interviewer neglects seeing the ways in which respondents use various techniques such as stories or narratives to answer questions. Mishler urged interviewers to allow respondents to answer questions in their own ways and resist the temptation to re-direct or re-focus conversation in the effort to get back on track to what the interviewer wants to know. As Ellis (2006) reminded us, "the object of an interview is not to simply get answers to questions, but to learn what the topic of the research is about for the participant" (p. 113).

Adams and Thompson (2011) provided a series of heuristics for researchers to use when "interviewing objects" and I elaborate here on those that are useful for this project. First, they advised researchers to draw on Latour's notion of "following the actor", paying attention to what gets connects and looking for "mediators *making* other mediators *do* things" (Latour, 2005, p. 217, as cited in Adams & Thompson, 2011, p. 738). Additionally, they suggested being open to the ways in which humans and non-

humans "operate together to produce patterns of connection" (p. 745). Here, focusing on how policy objects, people and scalar boundaries come together and co-constitute each other provides direction for accounting for the material relations in policy processes.

Seidman (1991) recommended that researchers begin with open-ended questions that allow the participant to take the interview in any direction he/she wants. One way is to use "grand-tour" questions that ask the participant to reconstruct a particular segment of an experience. I used questions, such as, "Take me through a day in your work life" or "Take me through an important project that you might consider typical of your work life". However, Ellis (2006) suggested that beginning with a few grand-tour questions may be challenging for novice researchers and advised preparing a number of open-ended questions to be explored throughout the interview. Such questions could be considered "possible prompts that may help the participant recall salient ideas and experiences" (p. 113). These questions might not be exhaustive nor should they entail a long list of prying questions. Rather, these questions might be appropriate at inviting participants to recall and talk about significant reflections.

John Law (2012) suggests that in performing ANT analyses, researchers ought to pay attention to processes and materialities. He suggests:

> First attend to practices. Look to see what is being done. In particular, attend empirically to how it is being done: how the relations are being assembled and ordered to produce objects, subjects and appropriate locations. Second, wash away the assumption that there is a reality out there beyond practice that is independent, definite, singular, coherent, and prior to that practice. Ask, instead, how it is that such a world is done in practice, and how it manages to hold steady. Third, ask how this process works to delete the way in which this sense of a definite exterior world is

> being done, to wash away the practices and turn representations into windows on the world. Four, remember that wherever you look whether this is a meeting hall, a talk, a laboratory, or a survey, there is no escape from practice. It is practices all the way down, contested or otherwise. Five, look for the gaps, the aporias and the tensions between the practices and their realities –for if you go looking for differences you will discover them. (p. 171)

Evaluating Qualitative Research

Packer and Addison (1989) discussed the challenges in evaluating qualitative research by first problematizing four approaches that are often used in evaluating an interpretive account: coherence, external validity, the participant's interpretation and consensus.

Seeking *coherence*, that is, plausibility or intelligibility, involves looking for *dis*confirming information (Packer & Addison, 1989). This search for inadequacies within an account, looking for what it misses or fails to consider. Packer and Addison claimed a necessity to "scrutinize and check an interpretation that appears coherent by searching out and focusing on material that doesn't make sense" (p. 281). By doing so, I will engage in a search for coherence that is not self-justifying but rather acknowledges contradictions and complexities of behaviour and action. The notion of *external evidence* can be sought by moving out of the text (including the transcript of interviews) and asking the participant whether or not I have understood what he/she meant. Doing so, the participant's intentions of what he/she wanted to share become the norm against which I will evaluate data, utilizing strategies such as member checks. Seeking *consensus* is a third approach that involves discussing the research among co-researchers or colleagues not involved in the project (within the parameters of confidentiality required through

research ethics) or through peer responses to published research reports. Finally, examining the relationship between my account and its applicability for future *practical implications* will be sought. While Packer and Addison argued that these four approaches offer their own contradictions and problems, the scholars insisted social scientists "drop the ideal of universal certitude" (p. 290) and be mindful, critical and skeptical about their own processes when using either of these approaches, focusing not on arriving at the certainty of the research but rather accepting the ongoing process of understanding.

Data Collection

I began data collection in May 2012 and finished in March 2013. This time for collecting data allowed me to develop a sense of the field, to begin to trace the connections between actors and to engage the participants in interviews and discussions about their work.

In considering how to begin data collection, I looked for "sites of decision-making power and of silent and/or silenced voices" (Yanow, 2011, p. 306), without being constrained to physical borders of one specific setting. As Yanow stated, "the policy itself is the site" (p. 306). I began the analysis at the university level, since I anticipated it would be the easiest to access. I used document analysis to identify policies related to internationalization that are at play in this particular site and how different actors are mobilized through these policies. I began searching through university websites to identify internationalization strategies and plans located in different institutional texts and well as identifying professors, administrative units and faculties that were listed on the website as having a focus in research or practice related to internationalization.

I analyzed the university's strategic plan and its plan for internationalization as a means of becoming familiar with the context of the university. My focus in this step of document analysis was on what policies *do* (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010; Shore & Wright, 2011), how actors come together or in ANT terms, are enrolled into networks through the policies, and which actors are included and excluded in these network. Drawing on ANT, actors in this case meant both people and material objects, i.e. policy documents and strategic plans, as they work to connect and assemble a heterogeneous network of actors. Here, I drew specifically on the advice of John Law (2009) who suggested the first step is to "attend to practices. Look to see what is being done. In particular, attend empirically to how it is being done: how the relations are being assembled and ordered to produce objects, subjects and appropriate locations." In doing so, I looked for policies that were actively promoting internationalization, such as the university strategic document and the university plan for internationalization. In looking at those texts, I considered which other actors were enrolled discursively in those texts, even those that seemed surprising or not obvious, and "how relations [were] being assembled and ordered" in the production of other objects, subjects and locations.

Second, Law (2009b) recommends to "wash away the assumption that there is a reality out there beyond practice that is independent, definite, singular, coherent, and prior to that practice. Ask, instead, how it is that such a world is done in practice, and how it manages to hold steady" (p. 171). In this step of the policy analysis, I looked at the ways in which actors seemed to be connected. I looked in the texts for actors, both human and non-human, that were mentioned as important to the processes of internationalization

and made note of them in my field notes journal in order to prompt questions at the interviews.

Once key actors had been identified at the university, I invited participants to interview and sought opportunities for observation of planning meetings to become familiar with the participants in their social environments (Merriam, 1998). Doing so helped me to build a holistic means of collecting data, in which observation opened the space for me to consider the whole situational, social context of the participants' experiences, to not only understand what something means for the participant in the context of his/her daily life (Merriam, 1998) but also as a reminder to me that my own observations and documentation processes are also part of the network (Law & Urry, 2003). Additionally, in the observations, I kept a field notes journal (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Merriam, 1998), complemented by memoing, to record my observations, continuing questions and initial thoughts developed through observation. I also wrote notes after each interview to reflect on the insights shared by participants.

Semi-structured interviews were used to talk with policymakers and other key actors about their work. The purpose of the interviews was to provide an opportunity to talk with individuals about their work, to ask about the partners with whom they work and the roles of their partners. The questions were open-ended to allow for the participants to offer and discuss the aspects of their work in policy that are important to each of them. The purpose of interview in ANT is to consider what actors do, not what they mean, as Latour (1999a) stipulated, "actors know what they do and we have to learn from them not only what they do, but how and why they do it" (p. 20). The purpose here was to understand the relations that develop in such actions.

Ellis (2006) recognized the challenge in creating the conditions which enable participants to talk about their experiences and, in this case, interactions, since participants often use "available discourses to say something that comes to mind readily and sounds sensible" (p. 113). To address such challenges, Ellis suggested that interviewers ask the participants to complete a pre-interview activity that "facilitates his or her recollection and reflection" (p. 113). I asked each participant in advance of the interview to bring a policy text from his/her work that connected him/her to other actors in internationalization. This pre-interview activity provided opportunities for the participants to speak about their daily work lives in ways in which were comfortable and meaningful to the participants.

Thirteen participants were interviewed at the university representing different positions. These positions sometimes overlapped, as some of the participants held senior administrative roles at the university in addition to their position as professor. Of these university participants, seven were professors, and of those, five held faculty-level administrative roles such as associate deans or directors of international programs, and one held a university-level position as vice-president. Also at the university, five of the participants interviewed were in non-academic positions, as senior administrators in departments or units related to internationalization. At the time of the interviews, the university professors and administrators had varying years of experience in their positions, with one senior administrator being new to the position within the last 2 years and others had over five years in administrative roles. As professors, all of those interviewed had over 10 years experience, though one was more recent to the university within the last two years. One participant was in a senior administrative position at

another Canadian university, but this participant was interviewed for the role he played in internationalization of higher education across the country. In a sense, this participant also brought a national perspective to the understanding of internationalization at the local level of the university.

I interviewed three participants at the governmental level and two participants agreed to have their data included in the study. One participant has been working in internationalization related fields for over 25 years. This participant is a senior-level administrator in this ministry. The other participant from the ministry had educational experience in the field of higher education and has worked in this ministry doing policy related work for over 5 years. The third participant asked to be excluded from the study, citing concerns about direct quotes and information provided in the interview included in the write up of the study.

I interviewed two participants at national organizations in Canada, at the Council of the Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) and the Canadian Bureau for International Education. Both of these participants had over 15 years of experience working in their organizations, and were specifically working on internationalization portfolios. As well, I interviewed one participant at a foreign national organization connected to the national government's foreign affairs (Embassy) in another country related to one of the networks around a major international research project at the university.

Table 1 Interview Participants

Participant	**Descriptor**
1	University/ Senior Administrator
2	University/ Professor

3	University/ Professor, Senior Administrator
4	University/Professor, Senior Program Administrator
5	Provincial Government/ Administrator
6	Provincial Government/ Administrator
7	University/ Senior Administrator
8	University/ Professor
9	University/ Senior Administrator
10	University/ Senior Administrator
11	University/ Professor, Senior Administrator
12	Withdrew
13	National/ Non-governmental, Senior Administrator
14	University/ Senior Administrator
15	International/ Governmental
16	University/ Senior Administrator
17	National/ Non-governmental, Senior Administrator
18	University/ Professor, Senior Administrator
19	University/ Professor, Senior Administrator

Table 1 Interview Participants

The following open-ended questions were asked at the semi-structured interviews:

1. Please tell me a bit about yourself and your work related to internationalization.
2. If you were able to bring a document/policy related to internationalization, I'd like to talk about that document with you. How is this document useful for your work in internationalization?
3. In what ways is this document useful in connecting you with other actors at different levels of governance, such as universities or national level actors?

4. Tell me about other policies/documents that are important to your work with other actors in internationalization? Where would we see the evidence of internationalization policy being carried out?
5. My interest in this project is to look at how different levels of actors (local, provincial, national and international) work together in internationalization governance. Tell me about some of the actors that you work with from different levels of governance.
6. From your perspective, what is the importance of internationalization? Of internationalization policy?
7. If someone were to ask you, where does internationalization work in higher education happen, what would you respond?
8. In talking with other people about internationalization, I am often struck by the way that different actors in some situations use locations of global and local. In what ways does the university act as a global actor? A local actor? Is there an important role for the university in defining what it means to be a global actor?
9. From your perspective, where would you place the work you do along a continuum from local to global?

Additionally, I sought to attend key meetings that participants attended. Early in the study, I was granted permission by a senior administrator at the university to attend the faculty-wide meeting focused on internationalization issues. I attended two of these meetings as they are held twice a year and fell within the data collection period. Each meeting lasted at least 2 hours and I took notes in my field journal about the issues that were being discussed and looked to trace the ways in which policy was talked about as connecting different actors. Additionally, I asked and was given permission to attend a regularly scheduled meeting held by the provincial government with policy makers and administrators from post-secondary institutions across the province that were working on internationalization issues and strategies. I attended a daylong meeting and took notes about the different policy topics that were raised by the provincial government and the

meeting attendees. For both types of meetings, I asked for and was granted permission from the chair of each meeting to attend as a researcher. I provided an information letter about my study and each chair signed consent forms. Each chair introduced me at the meeting, declaring my role in the meeting as a researcher. I volunteered to have my meeting notes from my field journal reviewed by anyone in attendance at the meeting, though the notes were never called for review by any meeting attendee.

Data Analysis

Drawing on a template for policy ethnography I received at a policy ethnography workshop at the Interpretive Policy Analysis Conference in Tilburg, the Netherlands, developed by Dr. Marlijn van Hulst (see Appendix), I used the following questions to guide the process of data analysis. The coding involved in reviewing the data for this study involved reading through the data in order to categorize (Merriam, 2011) according to the following questions:

RELATIONS

How does policy connect actors?

How does policy emerge through these connections? What is its relational ontology?

In order to look at this, consider, "What does policy do?"

- How does policy connect actors' **space? Activities? Knowledge? Practices?**
- How are power relations enacted through these connections?

SPACE

What are the ways in which space is organized through the relations between policy and actor? Describe the spaces?

What is located in these spaces?

- Who is there? What actions occur there? What activities occur there? What practices occur there?

Where do actors place themselves in these spaces?

How is power enacted in these spaces? How are these spaces created as powerful?

Drawing further on Law's (2009b) advice for ANT studies, I looked at how "the world holds steady", how stability is sought and maintained. Here, I looked at the means through which internationalization was performed as stable phenomenon, looking to see the actor-networks that were created through the texts through instances of material, strategic or discursive stability. I looked for ways in which internationalization was structured as a "thing", so that the black-box of its performance in texts could be examined by talking to actors and observing meetings.

Law (2009b) reminded us that no matter where you look, there is only practice and consequently, I aimed to examine the ways in which policy was practiced, through discursive, material and strategic means. Finally, Law suggests to "look for the gaps, the aporias and the tensions between the practices and their realities –for if you go looking for differences you will discover them." (p. 171). Of interest were the ways in which there were tensions in how actors assembled and the ways in which policy brought them together.

Assembling the Research

In the following three chapters, I will explore the policy networks that have emerged through the research by looking at the ways in which levels of actors connect through policies. Here, I pay particular attention in these analytical descriptions to the ways in which policy is a mediating actor in these networks. I begin by showing policy networks that emerge through the study by focusing on the assemblages of actors (such as

people, organizations, and policies) to illustrate how the policy networks are sociomaterial networks whereby policy itself is an actor that plays a role in mediating the relations in the network. Drawing upon ANT, I will argue that these networks are performative, so the focus here becomes theorizing and examining what emerges through these assemblages.

It is important here to make a clear distinction the ways that the notion of network is used in this chapter by clarifying two conceptual dimensions of the term network. First, the assemblage of actors is described as *policy networks*, defined by Rhodes (2006) as "sets of formal institutional and informal linkages between governmental and other actors structured around shared if endlessly negotiated beliefs and interests in public policy making and implementation" (p. 426). Policy networks are often considered as more loosely coupled arrangements (Rhodes, 1997), whereby actors interests are what bring them together. This means that these networks are not fixed or static, and that their configurations are fluid according to projects, goals, strategies or interests as they become realized. Ball and Exley (2010) suggested that an analysis focused on policy networks emphasizes the flow of ideas and people, conceiving of networks as both social structures and relational processes. From an ANT perspective, these are sociomaterial networks consisting of both human and non-human actors (Latour, 2005). Consequently, the policy networks described here consist of a range of policy actors, defined as individual people, organizations and a variety of policies, including strategies, briefing documents, frameworks, agreements, procedures, reports, proposals and accords.

Furthermore, the notion of network invoked by ANT suggests an aspect of performativity, whereby the focus is on what is produced as networks assemble. From

this perspective, the relationality of ANT prescribes that actors not be considered a priori, but rather that entities are understood as they are constituted through their enrolment into networks. A key point of distinction here is the relational aspect of brought to the fore in ANT, meaning that actors themselves develop within the networks in which they are enrolled, as they associate or disassociate with other actors to form networked associations, "which in turn define them, name them, and provide them with substance, action, intention and subjectivity" (Crawford, 2005, p. 1). This is the saliency of the notion of the actor-network, "an ontological definition" (Latour, 1999b, p. 5) that shows how things become, how they are assembled together and what is produced through these assemblages.

Taken together, the notion of sociomaterial and performative networks suggest a fluid nature of policy networks. Not only are the actors defined through the networks, but so are the networks themselves defined through the processes of association. Latour (1987) suggested there are moments where entities themselves are transported through the network, where they become taken up, interacted with and changed through the process of translation. Translation describes what happens when things connect, both human and non-human things, changing one another and forming links (Latour, 1987). But there are other moments when entities become stabilized and fixed and black-boxed, meaning the network of actors and interactions are hidden in the processes of translation so that only a final entity appears.

In the next three chapters, I lay out three policy networks that formed around three texts: a large international research partnership and a Memorandum of Understanding; an international project proposal for funding; and a federal and a pan-

Canadian strategy for internationalization. Each chapter includes the data and analysis, and for each network, I will provide descriptions of the actors, both human and policy actors, to consider the assemblages of multi-scalar actors, followed by a discussion of the ways in which policy mediates the relations in the network and what becomes performed through the interactions between policy and other actors.

Towards my goal of mapping the policy network and what becomes performed through the interactions between policy and other actors, in the subsequent chapter I describe how policy spaces come to be defined and stabilized through the assemblages of actors. Furthermore, I address how these effects of scale influence policymaking, recognizing that any project that involves mapping relates to the spatiality of power (Robertson et al, 2012), the inequities with which political power is exercised, how it gathers around the center, and what is included and excluded as policy networks assemble.

Conclusion

The methodology of this research project draws upon the analytical concepts offered by actor network theory and interpretive policy analysis. The intertwining of these analytical tools offers new and exciting means for interrogating the ways in which contemporary governance assembles multi-scalar actors and how such assemblages create powerful positions of global and local policy spaces. Furthermore, internationalization of higher education is an ideal context to investigate the ways in which policies, knowledges, people and processes come together. The focus on internationalizing higher education is increasing in both the discourses and strategies of universities in Canada and abroad. In this research project, I examined the relations

between actors as they are connected through internationalization policy, paying attention to how scale is created in the actors' interactions.

Chapter Four: Memorandum of Understanding as Policy Actor

The policy network that emerged around one initiative at the university illustrated the eclectic mix of different levels of policy actors that come together to govern internationalization. In this chapter, I focus on Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that were central in different capacities in internationalization work. Drawing on data that shows the many ways in which participants talked about the role of MOUs in internationalization, my analysis shows that these texts were not a single object for study. Rather, there were many performances of the MOU in the relations between different actors. While MOUs may be seen as finalized, fixed documents, moments in which signatures gather on a page and disappear into file cabinets, I aim to show how they are performed through many actions and decisions. The multiplicity of performance shows that connections in the networks around internationalization are forged not only in the momentous experiences of receiving large funding grants, but also in the simple acts of signing and not signing that appear to be benign. I draw on Latour's (1986) notion of power, that the act of defining what holds everyone together is where power is generated, to argue that the multiplicity of the MOU is what makes it powerful in assembling how internationalization work is performed.

In this chapter, I describe the enrollment of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) as an actor in this network, drawing on interview data collected with different participants at the university, in the provincial government and in national and international organizations related to one research project. The importance of the MOU in this research project signaled to me to pay attention to how other institutional actors were connected through MOUs in the university. Consequently, I discuss the ways in which

other participants in this study also described MOUs as being significant actors in their internationalization networks.

The Research Project

The project on which this network is based was a partnership between the university and an association of research centres in another country. It began with a focus on research related to natural resource development located in both a Canadian province and the international partnering country, largely centered on the exchange of researchers, scientists and scientific-technical knowledge related to addressing societal problems involving industry and science (Memorandum of Understanding of Research Cooperation, 2009). The project started up with over $20 million investment from the provincial government and matched funding from the international project's partnering national government.

One participant discussed how the plans from the university are not the only means by which partners connect, but certainly the institutional privilege given to certain strategic countries means certain connections become easier to develop and maintain. Other participants described the VP Research (VPR) Office as being instrumental in the project's inception. One participant intimated that the VPR's commitment to building large research partnerships was key to the viability of this particular project. One participant talked about the importance of the VPR in bringing about the project since the VPR committed a mandate to build provincial, national and international research partnerships.

> That was one incentive for the VPR to help find an institutional relation, and to find a partner where you are similar in the quality and excellence, where you are similar in strategy, similar in vision [of] where you want to

> go. And that developed with this [national research association in the European country]. It needed a couple of visionary minds, which in a very early stage came with the [president of a national research organization in the European country] which is funding the [research foundations in the European country], as a funding body for all the universities.

While the VPR was important, the participant went on to discuss the personal relations between the president of that research organization and industry partners and university connections in this province.

> [This president], when he was in Canada and he had some links with here, flying home via [parts of this country and seeing similarities between development being done here and being done in his own country]. There might be an area where you have some commonalities, synergies, we could learn from each other. I think that was a trigger when he talked to some of his colleagues and one of the colleagues [at this university] said, "Oh yeah, that seems to be worthwhile to explore." And soon a connection was made through [senior administration at this Canadian university] being here and [knowing about the European country because of their own familiar background with the European country]. [A professor in one faculty] came into the picture and he, [also having a connection to the European country through previous research relations with a research association in the European country], and his career building things and understanding and having an affinity and positive relations to it. When these minds got together, [they] said, "How can we explore what can be done to see if we can find commonalities?" Sort of mutual interest and complimentary expertise, not necessarily redundant expertise. You want to compliment what you're doing. So that's one aspect of it. (Participant 9)

As this participant described it, the commonalities extend beyond research interests, alone. Institutional connections were made through previous partnerships and activities and personal experiences.

Other central administration actors at the university played a significant role in the development of the project, through both personal connections and the status of the central administration as a decision-making position within the university structures. One participant reflected on the role of central senior level administrators at the university.

> So, the [senior university administrators] can remove barriers, can create the space for success but the professors have to do the work. So, you need both. Which schools we approach is entirely based on networks of contact. In my old job, I spent an awful lot of time in [another country] and it was all done through networks of contacts from the school I was at, [another Canadian university], over to [universities in European country]. And those contacts that then became my contacts formed the basis for [this large research partnership]….Cause the person who is the CEO of [that research association in another country] was the president of [a university in the European country] in 1999 and that's where I first met him. (Participant 3)

The VPR Office instigated a central office in the university to coordinate the project, including the appointment of a project coordinator to manage the relations between partners. One participant described the significance of this office in ensuring the project was viable. The VPR Office gave responsibility "to have such a project guided, supported, by a central office that helps facilitate planning and developing a strategy, developing a governance structure and public relations, connecting to the [partners in that other country] on all these many questions, which are more on the structure of administration and management versus the actual research side" (Participant 9). This formally separated the work of the administration of the project from the research aspects.

> Researchers are really strong and really good experts in their field. They, to a large extent, don't like administration, don't like report writing. They don't appreciate that and don't enjoy it and therefore doing it is a necessity they are forced to do. And trying to bring that together, giving the researchers as much opportunity to focus on research, versus supporting it with some administration and management support unit. That is something that had an impact on driving it to the stage where we are. Including organizing events with all the people involved and planning for developing this initiative idea. Developing this strategy to where it is going. And everything started when I explained it pretty much at the beginning with [the connections between Canada and that other country, in terms of their similarities in researching and developing this sector]. And developing the partnership, funding had been given for that." (Participant 9)

The link to the partnering association and its research centres is also managed through this central office, whereby bi-weekly phone conversations are coordinated with a focus on "discussing the multiple aspects coming out of planning events, setting up governance structures, building a website, having communications pieces coming out, addressing concerns which are coming in [from the European country] asking questions of why and how far and things which need to be addressed so that our partners can continue without stalling" (Participant 9).

As mentioned earlier, the provincial government is enrolled in the network through its commitments for funding. Due to Constitutional obligations and responsibilities, the purview of education, including post-secondary, is a provincial jurisdiction in Canada. Consequently, any government funding for universities is largely considered to come from provincial jurisdictions, though it is worth noting the concern from many critics of the impact of neoliberal policies on the realm of higher education

through the privatization and increasing reliance on individual funding contributions to university budgets. Therefore, the presence of the provincial government in this network through its constitutional obligations is expected. However, the provincial government also appeared a part of this network due to the nature of the research project, working with industry on the natural resource development that provides revenue generation for the province. One participant spoke about the importance of the provincial funding for this project to be able to function at its current levels, specifying how involvement from graduate students and faculty is dependent on this funding.

> And there are students who are recruited and who are enrolled who would not otherwise be here [without funding mechanisms that support internationalization]. Same with the [large research partnership between this university and a research centre in another country]. [Over $20] million from [the other country], and [over $20] million from [this province]….There's a whole range of activity. We've hired professors and students to do the work. These are students that might not otherwise be here at all. Or, if they are here, they might not be as well-funded. (Participant 3)

Participants mentioned the ministry responsible for post-secondary education as being an important part of the network, particularly for the ministry's interest in funding research in post-secondary institutions that would benefit industry development in the province. One participant spoke about the support of a provincial funding to establish international projects, saying, "[This province] sees it as a plus, government sees it as a plus to be engaged internationally because we're so export-orientated and so on" (Participant 14). Another participant spoke about the funding being important to establish longer-term commitments in the project.

> And there are multiple aspects which have all been supporting and driving this initiative along the path. Of course, it helps if funding comes in place and there was a lot of work done behind the scenes from people at the university. [Senior level administration at this university], speaking to the government. With the government having some funding allocated for such international partnerships and with the $25 million we got from the provincial government, you are able to build a solid partnership over the five year period which has been discussed. (Participant 9)

However, in tracing the provincial connections to the network, the provincial government came to be described as more than merely a funding actor. For some participants, the significance of another provincial actor was noteworthy: a provincially established authority bringing together industry, provincial government and university interests through research development. This authority acts in an advisory capacity to the minster responsible for post-secondary education, providing strategic advice related to policies to support provincial economic goals and strategies. The authority was established through a provincial act focused on research and innovation. Its membership consists of a body of international researchers and entrepreneurs in public policy areas covered by the authority's work. In terms of this policy network, this authority served as a direct link to industry, connecting other members of the network to industry partners focused on resource development. One participant spoke about this authority as being able to provide funding to enhance the worth of the project.

> We work with the [provincial government], mainly in the provincial context. With [the provincially established authority related to innovation and research], these organizations, the university interacts for funding purposes but also to make meaning for research which has some application at the end is a benefit for - it sounds a bit like these phrases, but it's, at the end the research it has some meaning. (Participant 9)

Later, this participant went on to speak about the way that this authority brings the provincial government closer into the research project, not only in providing funding, but also institutional legitimacy for what is produced through the research.

> I think [this provincial authority] plays a crucial role. They are these arms-length technology experts, in particular when it comes to the natural science piece. That's where they play a role of giving advice to the government on [areas such as], 'Is that a good thing to do? Is it where government should engage in?'.... So these are important and critical partners to keep informed and to include in it. (Participant 9)

The authority is also firmly embedded in the institutional framework of this research project, as members from the authority also serve as members on the governance board of the research project. Consequently, there is an apparent attempt to align the authority, a provincial government "arms-length" group of experts, with the research project's formalized structures. In this way, there is a tighter connection between the research project and the economic goals of the provincial government.

The network involved in this research initiative extends beyond the structures of the Canadian university, the research association in another country and the provincial government. As described by the participant above, the partnership began between central administration within the university and research association organizations. However, in talking with one of the embassy affiliates from the international partner country involved with this initiative, there were changes within the national ministry of foreign affairs in the previous four years that enabled the grounding for this initiative. The Foreign Minister of the European country added science as one of the four pillars of international relations policy and such change brought about the development of a centre connected to the Foreign Ministry in the European country. This participant is employed

as an embassy affiliate at the centre. In describing the project, this participant focused on the Canadian province as being a key partner for this particular project but also in building future partnerships within industry and the business community.

> That research initiative between the [province and the research association in the European country] came about, or signed their [agreement] in 2009 and it took, people say, about three years to find the right partners and make this thing happen. And then this local initiative here in [this city] thought, well, if we have sort of an institution that could help find the right partners, bring the right partners together, it keeps the conversation going then it would be way faster for future collaborations. And that's why the Centre was founded, also in 2009. (Participant 15)

The participant from the embassy described the centre as an important feature in bringing together the right partners and facilitating conversations between not only the research partners at the university or research institute level, but also with business and corporate partners located in both the Canadian provincial context and the other country. Descriptions of the centre on its website position its work as two-fold: as an intermediary in the development of research and innovation partnerships, particularly focused on fostering business relations, and as a coordinator for project related activities. Initiated through funding by the national foreign office in the partnering country, this centre receives supplementary funding through user fees for services for projects.

Another participant described this embassy affiliate's work as "helping the government of [this province] and companies in [this province] to connect to [another country]. And as well as [companies from another country], especially when you have smaller companies who don't have a big international office or which are not yet operating internationally to help to make contacts to bring them in" (Participant 9).

Indeed, participants expressed the embassy's role in the network as integral to keeping the contact between partners fluid and tight. One participant described the role of the embassy in this relation as a lubricant that makes for smooth working relations.

> They are facilitating contact. They are ready to intervene if obstacles are arising which are seriously threatening. There is interest in what's going, they are connecting with government bodies. They're connecting with industry. They're … it's hard to finger point it but they are a bit like the lubricant in helping to avoid that something grinds to a halt. So that's, I think, has elements of importance of the support to be provided through these offices, as well. And there is some, you know, bringing two nations working together also is a mandate for their office as well. (Participant 9)

The connection from the centre to the foreign office is clear, as the centre's inception was led by an honorary consul whose office is located in the same city as the university. Additionally, the connection to the university-research partnership is visible; the honorary consul is a member of this Canadian university's senate. Other participants also expressed the connection between embassy staff, from both Canada and the international partnership country, and the university-research association partnership initiative. Where do we see the formal connection between these actors?

The project is represented in university institutional documents through an *MOU* and a *Research Consortium Agreement*. The project coordinator described these two texts as fulfilling very different purposes. For this coordinator, the MOU signifies the formal aspect of the relationship that signifies that the partners were willing to work together. While MOUs in this university generally follow a template set out by the institution's legal counsel (Participant 10; Participant 18), this particular MOU addresses the working relationship between the partners. Signed in 2009 by the university president and the

partnering association's president, the MOU for this particular project details the collaborative use of facilities, instruments and equipment between the two partners and their institutions. The purposes of the agreement are detailed and include the strategic planning of joint activities, the implementation of research, hosting of research related workshops and conferences both between the partners and with the larger scientific community, as well as the exchange of researchers, including an emphasis on those who are newly starting their careers. The MOU features specifics on how the purposes shall be implemented, the confidentiality of the work as well as the length of term of the agreement.

The Research Consortium Agreement is a much longer document that details the finer aspects of the partnership. The project coordinator described this agreement as necessary to elaborate on the particulars of the research partnership.

> It's talking about [issues such as] how do we handle IP? How do we handle publications? Getting in some relations, who's informing whom about what? What are the structures we are building to have a governance for that relation? How do we … What are the requirements we could expect saying there should be a governance? It's important. If you don't say it anywhere then there could be one or could not. If you don't have one it's more difficult to drive forward and giving it some of these things is very critical. (Participant 9)

Additionally, the university's academic plans and strategic documents were positioned as key in being able to steer the direction of international projects such as this. The policy documents that this participant discussed are two main documents referenced throughout the data collection in this study.

One document is the *vision for the university*, coming out of the university president's office. It is a guiding document that lays out the vision, mission, goals and principles upon which the university should operate. While internationalization does not feature as specific principle, the notion of a globalized student and staff population is highlighted. Additionally, a global perspective among the staff, curriculum and research is featured throughout the vision document. As a vision document, the text focuses on broad aims to be achieved through the practices of the university administration, faculty, staff, researchers and students.

The second document that is referenced is the *academic plan for the university*. Building upon the framework of the principles listed in the vision document, this academic plan provides specifics for how to achieve the vision including specific objectives and measurements for evaluating progress towards these ends. Included in these objectives is the intention to increase international partnerships and international students on campus.

This plan positions the university within an increasingly global community both within the academic context of the university and the larger geographical location in which the university is housed. The commitment to internationalize is honed mostly in the section that describes the plan for connecting with community. Here, the focus on international teaching and learning, study abroad, international students and international research collaborations is expressed as part of the expected outcomes. However, the commitment to local communities is featured alongside the internationalization aspirations, positioning the university in both a local and global context.

Participants mentioned these two documents as key drivers of such international projects being realized.

> The university developed these institutional strategies… these are the two institutional guiding documents at the president's office. And at the provost's office, [one of the documents] is the answer from the execution [side of the process], the academic, to the vision of the president. And in this strategy paper, there has been identified some geographic focus areas which to my understanding was a critical part to establish a relation in what I'm involved in, this [large research partnership between this university and a research association in another country]. Not prohibiting any other relations, building with others, multiple countries, there is a focus saying, we have certain relations with certain countries we want to look at as preferred partners….It doesn't mean you are not working with others, but there is this form of the strategy. And to build institutional partners, you have to be going out and approaching different organizations, saying to the universities, "Do you want to work together?" (Participant 9)

Each of these texts played a different role in the project. The Research Consortium focused on the specifics of activities of the research project. The university strategic texts acted as informal texts that provided context for different actors in the research project to strategize activities and connections. Both of these texts have a capacity for institutionalizing the work that gets done in internationalization. However, the MOU in this research project became an interesting text for me in the way that participants described its role.

The MOU signing for this initiative was significant in that it brought together actors who played a political role in the project. The ambassador from the partnering country stationed in Ottawa attended the MOU signing at the Canadian university. One

participant described the way the diplomatic relations of the project were important to the realization of the project, "to make stuff happen".

> In addition, there was very strong support through the diplomatic channels. The Canadian Embassy in [the European country], in particular, has been helping to foster the relationship, building links, helping to make stuff happen. And vice versa, [the European country's embassy here] in Canada, the ambassador in Canada, one of his first visits when he arrived was participating in the MOU signing in [this partnership]. He was a strong follower over the years….he was very interested, very supportive, a very strong advocate for what's happening. As well as the honorary consul [of the European country] which is located here in [this city]….he is even a member of the senate of the university and he's actively involved in the university. He has helped to build links and make connections, facilitate at this very early stage in a tremendous way and has been supporting and coming along with all that is growing over time as well. (Participant 9)

This participant described the MOU as being an important instigator for bringing in the Embassy office and local affiliate. He suggested that this centre office was "a follow-up from signing this MOU, getting it off the ground. Saying, 'ok, here is this other element where we want to build on'" (Participant 9).

Many participants in the study reflected on the MOU as a significant policy actor that brought together different actors. Students were enrolled in the network through their presence in the MOU and Consortium Agreement that emerged through this project. "A younger generation of scientists" is specifically mentioned in both the MOU and the Consortium Agreement as being key to the achievement of the project's goals. Participants reflected how students impacted the work of the project.

> And then as a side note to this event, then [our partners in the European country] and in particular students and our [partners there] organized a

> field trip, day field trip. So, we went to a great tour [to see how the research is being used there]. And seeing that firsthand, it's a bit like school of a field trip but the conversation happening at these things are very stimulating. Very encouraging and the students, you know, reflecting on getting engaged in that. And students organizing that, it's another effect on the learning side where students know what it means to organize a trip for 40 people. (Participant 9)

Given the role of the MOU in this research project in connecting diverse actors, I sought out ways in which other participants in the study expressed the role of MOUs in their internationalization efforts. Several participants throughout the study mentioned the role of the MOU in various international partnerships in connecting multi-scalar actors related to internationalization. I argue that the MOU could then be posited as a powerful actor in the networks that form around internationalization.

Analysis: Understanding the MOU

From an ANT perspective, Latour (1986) theorized the shift from viewing power through a model of diffusion, whereby power is transferred from one actor to another, to a model of translation, whereby power is *generated* for one actor by others *doing* action. That is, actors are not powerful on their own; it is the way they are deemed powerful through the actions of other actors. In policy analysis, such shift focuses attention to the places and sites of action and requires examination of how power emerges from interaction between actors. In this next section, I place MOUs in a broader context of how they enrolled different actors in internationalization work throughout the university context. By doing so, I aim to show that the MOU is a powerful policy actor as it enrolls other actors and is used to legitimize the network through those connections.

In this section, I will begin by discussing how participants in the study expressed how the MOU works with other actors in the network to perform legitimacy in the building of institutional relations within the policy network by 1) both enrolling and excluding different actors into the network and 2) establishing the commitment of network actors. In the subsequent chapter, through a discussion of how power functions to connect actors in networks (Latour, 1986; Barnes, 1986), I will examine how legitimacy for the network is performed through these relations, looking at what is transformed through these connections and what is made absent.

Enrolling Actors

Some participants talked about the instrumentalist aspects of MOUs and other related agreements. One senior level administrator's role in the university pertained to international work on a broader scale beyond the scope of one particular project. When asked why MOUs and other agreements are needed, this participant spoke about the complexity that exists in bringing together different policy actors and interests. This participant suggested that while MOUs offer agreed details in principle, they are not binding and do not lay out specifics of how such details will put into practice. For this participant, this is a strength of the MOU, in that there is no necessity for guaranteed permanency among partners.

> I think it's complex, [a] very complex thing. You need agreements because you need a guarantee of a number of things. You need protection. For instance, we have, when we do an agreement, we have a whole list of agreements. We do a general MOU basically, you and I, two partners, we want to be friends. We want to say in principle we agree to do the following number of things, unlimited. However, an MOU is not binding,

> so therefore whatever we agree is on paper. It is not a full implementation. (Participant 10)

This complexity indicates the level of fluidity that exists in MOUs, that is, what is referred to in the MOU can be enacted or can be left out as the relationship develop.

Another participant discussed how the MOU enrols actors into the network of a research partnership during the initial stages of the relationship, without a necessary participation of those actors in defining their own role. They become associated through the details of the MOU and the particulars of their involvement is left to the way in which the MOU is further enacted in the daily practices of the research. In this case, he specifically discussed the way that graduate students become enrolled in a particular research partnership's network through co-supervision.

> And the result of all that is [that] we've committed to sign an MOU [in the near future]. Our provost is going to; we've already lined this up, that our provost is going to be there to sign this and we've identified who the lead is going to be here at [this university] to take the next step to developing this collaborative research program. We've identified the lead at [that partnering university]. We have a target [in the winter term] that we have that initial document before that MOU [is] fleshed out and then we expect that the partnership will include co-supervision of graduate students, [a] major research program where our initial target is at our end we get a million dollars a year for 5 years to support research. They will do the same at [the other country's end]. (Participant 14)

Another participant discussed how the student exchange agreements allow for a sifting through of students, to guarantee that partnerships develop with the interests of certain students in mind. This participant stipulated that the student agreements advance

with a goal of "protecting students", so that the institutions can effectively manage their own learning interests.

> [The MOU stipulates that the] student will pay tuition at [the] home institution; they don't pay tuition at [the] host. So in that case, we exchange students. Also, we attract tuition, we attract a lot. And because you have an agreement that you guarantee students don't pay tuition at the host institution, you guarantee the student will get the credit from [the courses they took abroad] that they can bring back to [their] academic studies. Because whenever we want students to go abroad, we don't want to waste time, right? And we want a guarantee, for instance, we have an agreement with Japan, we say we need a language requirement. You don't want someone with no English sitting in the class. That's not good for him to study. So, then we will also say those things because we have [an] official agreement so [the] student can register as a student in our system so there will be, we will have benefits, like to have [a pass for transit] and whatever. And the other thing, because we are [an] official partner legally, students will be participating in your health insurance if there are other issues or whatever happens, right? We will protect students. (Participant 10)

This type of involvement asserts agency for the university to decide what is the in the best interest of students. In this way, it goes beyond protecting the students, but also protects the university from students whose performance may not be up to the standard required to participate in the academic programming. Students are enrolled in the university through the MOU as a resource to be managed, like other resources, such as transit passes and health insurance.

Additionally, this participant spoke from her extensive experience working at the central level of international programming at the university as to the ways in which MOUs follow a protocol that connect senior level administration into the network, such

as the Dean of a faculty. This participant elaborated on the processes internal to the university around formalizing agreements, demonstrating how the MOU brings about other processes, as well.

> However, we do have internal processes to go through: should we sign an agreement, should we not sign agreement? So, we have kind of protocol, you know process, in place. Basically [if] any faculty member wants to have an agreement, [they will] have to get the Dean's endorsement. The Dean has to be providing some support letter to say, yes, this is a part of our strategy; we want to work with this university. So we get a lot of faculties having an agreement with many universities…. but then if the Dean has approved them, we go for it. (Participant 10)

When asked if the Dean was a key person in MOU processes, the participant affirmed this role as being important, referring to the Dean as the CEO of the decentralized structures in which faculties work. Having support from the Dean involves more than a symbolic gesture of approval; resources often accompany a Dean's support: "We want the Dean to say yes because if the Dean says yes that means that he's committed to resources to run it" (Participant 10). The Dean functions as a gatekeeper, both through the control of resources but also by validating particular projects by doing so.

At another time, this participant spoke about how the formalized process for MOU signing involves the Provost and the process for approving MOUs to be forwarded to the Provost's office is handled by the central university international office. Here, the involvement of the Provost shows how the process becomes institutionalized through the central office.

> We have general practices because [according to] the written policy, we have a signing authority. That's by the university policy and, in terms of those kinds of policies, it's a practice…. Even centrally if we say, "You

> may have a senior administration to visit some countries", some have the protocols [that] you need to have a signed agreement [when you participate in these formalized visits], [so] you have to rush to get an MOU done….I think the Provost is the main signature for the university for all international agreements. Another protocol, that has been there for over a year now and that will always be there is that any agreement to be signed by senior administration had to be recommended by [the central university international office]. So, we will have a letter or memo to the Provost to say what this MOU is about or who initiated it. Is there is money involved or has the Dean attached that letter, support letter from the faculty? So, in that case, we will have a paper trail. Everything is there. (Participant 10)

In this participant's comments, we see again that while there are formalized processes in place, there are variances in how the most senior level administrators are enrolled. In certain circumstances, the Provost's presence is necessary, where deemed important by the partnering institution. In other cases, the Provost may only appear as a signature on a document. Another participant, who works in an international office in a faculty, also echoed this process for how MOUs are handled by the Provost and the central university international office.

> I have a template. I know what goes in the document. There's also legal counsel at the university that you send that to and then you get the signatures that you need from the Provost all relayed through [the central university international offices] because they're the ones where sort of everything kind of converges from the different faculties. (Participant 7)

Provincial governments were also enrolled into the network, as one participant described how an MOU could provide proof that a formalized relation existed in a partnership in order to secure resources from a provincial government. "Sometimes the

government to government or government to institution, they want to have that showpiece, [that says] we are friends. We are official partners, [and] therefore, the government can give you funding" (Participant 10). Of course, there is no guarantee that you will receive funding, but the evidence of a partnership as presented through a signed MOU was deemed necessary in order to seek government funding. Another participant reflected the same sort of process as being necessary to secure external funding at the national level. This participant holds a key position in the international office in one faculty, and she expressed the necessity of an MOU to receive grants from major national organizations but also how this process is not always certain.

> Also, sometimes when you have joint agreements internationally, you need a signed document in order to obtain funds. So, sometimes you just create that frame so that it's official and there's evidence and then you can then go seek funding. So CIDA [the Canadian International Development Agency], for example, in Canada or IDRC [International Development Research Centre] will need to see a signed document that shows the connection and the relationship before funds are distributed for research. (Participant 7)

Here, this researcher referred to the necessity to "create the framework" of an agreement which provides a legitimacy to the project, in order that you have evidence of the relationship. While the quality of the relationship cannot be evaluated from an MOU alone, it certainly provides institutional legitimacy of research partnerships that are necessary to satisfy external funders that a partnership exists.

This participant also described how an MOU provides legitimacy for other institutions when they seek funding within their own national and local contexts. "We would sign an MOU if we see a need for a joint project. If they develop a joint project

together and they're going after funding in their respective countries then there needs to be an agreement. I will help them with that agreement" (Participant 7). Other participants confirmed that this scenario often arises.

Participants stressed that the MOU has significant potential to enroll other sources of university funding. One participant suggested that MOUs are often sought by professors who are striving to establish relationships with other universities. However, senior level administrators who work in faculty-level or central university international offices play the role as mediator, advising faculty about when an MOU is needed. One participant was clear that "you don't always needs an MOU to do research" (Participant 4). Another participant who worked at the faculty level international office stated that she tries to encourage professors to explore international partnerships, and that the professors' involvement is necessary since "there's no way [the Dean] or I could, or the Executive Team which is the Associate Deans…could do all the international work. You know, you really need the professors to do it, to want to do it, to benefit from it" (Participant 7). In this lengthy excerpt, she described the tension she encounters in her role between encouraging professors to seek formalized partnerships and restricting the formality of the relationships.

> And then when they do come to me and say, "Hey, you know, there's this university interested in signing something with us," then my job is to understand the relationship and then suggest the best course of action that suits them both and you tend to see the willingness from the different parties to really make a go of it. When it's a really, you know when someone is really passionate about something, you can tell and then you work with them to get it signed. If it's just a normal request and they're passing the information I appreciate that too. I rather that happen than not,

> but then in that case I just tell them you know what, you can still have collaboration, but you don't really need a frame, you don't need a document outlining that unless you're going to need some funding and the funding institution needs to see a piece a paper.

Above, the participant elaborated on the checks and balances that looked for evidence of a project with "passion" or one that could exist without an MOU. However, later, this participant signified that the MOU signing initiated a broader scale of movement, "the whole apparatus" would be initiated for projects where it was necessary. In how this participant described the process, the MOU is key to enrolling actors that engage as powerful.

> So, I find myself and the dean and chairs triaging a lot in terms of, you know, is it really necessary to move the whole system, the whole apparatus to get a signature? Because you know there is a whole mechanics, you go through legal and you show the template to your partner, your partner has to comment, it could be months before you agree on the text that is being signed and then you have to convince your Provost to sign the document or the authority from whatever university to sign the document. So, there are steps.

Finally, this participant suggested there was a role of providing a "reality check" for professors, to question if there real possibilities "tangible" and "profitable" results following a project.

> So, whatever request comes, I join in their enthusiasm. I give them a quick reality check. I give some suggestions like you trying to get to the bottom of it and for the most part I try to be a source of information and a resource at some point if they really want to go forward. And most of the time they really are thankful because they themselves, too, only want to do that kind of administrative work for the partnerships that they find to be really the most profitable. And by profitable, I mean in a very broad sense

> of just having results, you know tangible results very soon right after that collaboration. And some of our professors are okay with that. They don't have to have something signed, but if their partner asks they have to come to someone with that question. (Participant 7)

This participant's lengthy descriptions showed how she understands the process to require a lot of negotiation, between professors, researchers, administration, and institutions. Indeed, her reflection on the process shows the political aspects of the work that goes into signing or not signing, and the mobilization of several actors once the process is set in place, deemed to be "profitable". There is not one objective process; rather the MOU becomes a negotiation tool for the legitimacy of projects as they come to be performed through formal or informal institutional relations.

Another participant also discussed her own process for advising professors about when an MOU or other agreement was needed.

> All faculty members research, they all have international collaborator projects. Sometimes, in most cases they don't require an agreement because you don't require institution resources, mandatory human resources or materials, right? If you don't require significant investment from the university, what's the point of having an agreement? (Participant 10)

However, this was not always the case. There were times when these agreements were helpful to bring in additional resources. One participant elaborated, "For some of the university funding through [the central university international office] it might help to be able to say we've got this MOU with them and we're building on it or whatever. We're looking at some new activities. I think it depends on who the audience is if it would help" (Participant 4).

In the above referenced statements, participants talked about the capacity of the MOU to create evidence of a committed partnership. However, the notion that MOUs ought to reflect the quality of a relationship was also brought up and raises an important tension in the role of MOUs in bringing together actors. While the MOU may be used to provide evidence of a relationship for funding or for universities' own internal procedures, some participants reflected that the MOU ought to reflect "action", meaning actualized activities already existing in a partnership. In this way, there was some reflection that the MOU should reflect action beyond a symbolic event of recognizing each other's institutions on websites and promotional materials.

> I think it's important because you want to be able to promote each other. You want to be able to put your name and their name on a website or a document, so I think that's important. But the most important and more than the document itself is that there's actual activity. One of the things that gets me very frustrated is when I have I signed agreement in a file cabinet and no action leading up to the signing; after the signing, nothing. And it's collecting dust. (Participant 7)

Establishing Commitment

Participants also presented the MOU as a means by which to establish and stabilize relations between network actors, provide both discursive and material stability (Law, 2009) to the partnership relationship. Several participants spoke about the way that the MOU is often used to denote a relationship that is based on prestige and excellence. One participant, in speaking about the work of the VPR in establishing the university as an institution of top quality research, suggested that the MOU ought be used to signify partnerships where they are happening. This participant described the necessity of the MOU for instilling life to partnerships.

> For the university, as a institution and to be recognized as a global centre of excellence as a place where top quality, top class research is done, you want to build, beside this individual researcher relations, also some institutional relations. And institutional relations, in the past, have been measured to a certain extent on the number of memorandums of understanding signed between institutions. If you're looking in the inventory of the university, you find several hundred [MOUs]. Your impression if you're looking at the campus, there are not several hundred of really active relations that are living. So, the university, with the recent senior administration coming to this institution, and the ambitious goal to rise in the ranks, provid[ed] opportunity in a place for delivering excellent research and fostering that, retaining people. (Participant 9)

The term "living" relations suggests that the connections between the partners is productive as it performs a lively and prosperous research connection.

Other participants signified that the achievement of MOU signing with certain prestigious universities was something that this university would "jump through hoops" to achieve, regardless if significant outcomes or partnerships have been established.

> Or sometimes it's a courtesy. [For example, if] you have a very senior President from Harvard, just to name one, come to [this university], we would want to dream to sign [an MOU] so we would reach out, jump through hoops to sign it, through the process or whatever right, say absolutely we want it and then we would print that we are partners of Harvard University. (Participant 10)

This participant later went on to describe how this sort of scenario has played out in the university in some instances. While the university has many delegations of visitors from different universities, it is not always desirable to sign an agreement with every visiting university president because there is no previous relationship established. The signing of an MOU is not needed in these cases, as there is little benefit to doing so for

this university. As one participant put it, "I think [an MOU] kind of forces us to make a commitment about what we are going to do with another partner" (Participant 4). This level of commitment is not always desirable, though the parameters upon which signing might happen can be negotiated.

> We have a lot of international universities when they come with their President, especially if their President is really, really respected in the European country, they say we want to sign [an] agreement when we are here. We often say no because really how can you do it? We have not had a council discussion so what do we want to do with this signed agreement? But on the other hand, we also find ways to support whatever we can.

This participant later described what this looked like in practice.

> For instance, next month we will have a delegation coming from China and the President of one of the top ten universities, very famous, very respected President in China. He said he wanted to meet with [the university President] and he wants to sign a contract. We can say we don't really have a lot, we have a lot of research going on, [and] it's not worth, deserved [of having] a finalized agreement. Finally, we say okay we're going to sign one agreement, we're going to sign an MOU that's not binding, we're going to sign [an agreement regarding a scholarship program for PhD students] because we know that we want to have more students from that university to come do PhD [studies] with full funding, right? So, we have to really create some situations that are in our benefit, but also [so the other university President is] not losing face, right? (Participant 10)

In that lengthy quote, the participant illustrated not only that other actors were enrolled, but that these actors, such as PhD students, became mediators to translate an informal relationship into a meaningful and prosperous event. Even though the activities between

the two universities "were not deserving of a formalized agreement", the MOU became a way to connect the universities; to make a pathway for students with full-funding, funding that would flow from the other university to this one.

One participant who is involved in the day-to-day managing of the previous mentioned large research partnership distanced the MOU from the daily work of what goes on in the project, to rather suggest that the MOU works to define the formality of the relationship between the signatory partners. Here, this participant describes this level of formality by using the analogy of "getting in a marriage or just living together".

> They don't enhance the day-to-day work. But I think they play a critical role. You can, with a careful use of an MOU and engaging an MOU, you can distinguish some informal commitment from a formal commitment. It takes a little bit, a lawyer going through … your putting your signature on and it means 'Ok, there's a relation'. And it's a bit like if you compare it to how people are getting in a marriage or just living together saying, "Yeah, you can walk off anytime. But here's a little bit of a contract, of an engagement." You go in and you want to notify somebody if you are not interested to do it. (Participant 9)

This participant later went on to ascribe an importance to the timeline of an MOU, stipulating that the relation is not guaranteed beyond the memorandum's set timeframe. He used the term "dangerous" to suggest that relations without timelines can put an institution in an awkward place of uncertainty of commitment.

> And it's important to structure with some thought. Putting some time limit on. MOUs which don't have an expiration date are very dangerous. An MOU where you have a sufficient time where you work and then you make a recommitment saying 'oh yeah, it's valued' or you say 'no, it has done, it has served it's purpose, we terminate here'. It's perfectly fine. But don't [leave] this thing hanging. Ever. (Participant 9)

Another participant who was involved in a senior level faculty administration role within this research project also described how an MOU might define the relationship between research partners. He talked about the MOU signifying a certain level of a relationship and that this signatory relevance was neither always possible nor desirable with any institution. Rather, the MOU should be written to reflect a level of commitment to the particularities of a significant relationship. This participant commented that the MOU ought to reflect a commitment to bring about action.

> I have much more confidence actually the more experience I get with this, the more importance I place on the details of the connections that you make between, among individuals and the [objects of research]. There's often a tendency, you know, we get delegations from all other the places that come here. They want to sign an MOU, they spend an hour in my office, they're gone. And something gets filed away in the cabinet. That's almost a total waste of time. I mean, you have a nice, maybe you have a nice discussion maybe. And something could come of it but the chances are not great. And generally speaking, that approach results in a whole bunch of MOUs with little action on the ground. So, the model that is much more likely to get success is where you decide that you have a smaller number of partners but you're going to put some effort into that. (Participant 14)

In talking about an administrative role in one faculty at the university, another participant provided a case in the faculty in which this participant works that exemplified how MOUs can be used to demonstrate the level of commitment by the faculty. This participant previously worked in a role which involved advising faculty members about arranging international partnerships that focused on longevity and commitments that were filled with activities. This participant elaborated, "But many times I would say to faculty, you know, go ahead and work with that person in another country and let's see how the

relationship develops. Because MOUs, I think the university doesn't want the empty ones where you just do it because, you know, of one activity and then nothing happens for five years." In this description of these sorts of connections, this participant remarked that MOUs are not necessary to simply do research involving one faculty member. Rather, this participant suggested that an MOU is signed to show a level of commitment from a faculty, beyond the interests of one professor or researcher. Here, this participant talked about how the level of commitment from the faculty might be indicated through the MOU as a "triple word score," designating a desire for partnerships that bring in several benefits.

> So that's kind of, you know, how do you get a triple word score, where working with a university is not just one person. The other thing I would look at and obviously talk with our Dean about is, is it one faculty member? We often get one faculty member who will say [that] we want to have an MOU with this university because I want to do research. And I always say to them you can go ahead and do research. The university's looking for a build up of several things that you've done together and with more than one faculty member over years. So, it doesn't just happen because of one faculty member here and one there. They're looking for kind of a progression of activities and more than one faculty member involved because, you know, if that person leaves, you want this relationship or partnership to carry on. (Participant 4)

The levels of commitment were varying throughout the MOU. In some instances, it was clear that an MOU would be used as a means to bring about action, that active relations, "living" relations had to follow. However, that action is not clearly laid out. In some instances, action involves demonstrated activities and in other cases it denotes stature and position.

Performing Power of Association through the Multiplicity of the MOU

For Latour (1986), the exercise of power is effect, rather than cause. This concept requires viewing power as a *consequence* of collective action, so that power is viewed through a performative definition whereby it is something that has to be *made.* In this view, power is not something that actors inherently hold or possess due to the nature of authority in their positions or locations within institutions. In a socio-material approach to studying power, the role of interactions between human and material actors becomes the focus. As Latour described, "Power is now transferred to the many resources used to strengthen the bonds. The power of the manager may now be obtained by a long series of telephone calls, record-keeping, walls and clothes and machines" (p. 276). It is in *practice* that powerful actors come to be so, through the action of defining or redefining "what 'holds' everyone together" (p. 273).

As the participants in the study talked about the MOU, there are many performances of the MOU in the relations between different actors. While some participants described the MOU as though it were an accessory that was not required in forming partnerships for research, there were clearly cases were the MOU was a powerful tool for leveraging institutional relations. For a few participants, the MOU was a standard form, a standard process that involved connecting with different locations and office across campus. Yet, from many of the participants' descriptions of the MOU, its performance was not standard. There was a "tinkering" (Mol, 2010) in how the MOU came to be performed. As Mol (2010) described, tinkering involves active shifting, changing and fluidity. Indeed, the participants' reflections about the MOU indicate that its very nature is determined though a process of tinkering.

A standard form document, with "a template" that some participants intimated, the MOU appears in some instances as a stable, fixed entity. However, Latour (2005) theorized the processes that produce stability are often invisible. Therefore, ANT analyses trace the interactions between actors in networks that black-box or hide these processes of assembly and reassembly. Stability is interrogated in ANT so that what is seen as static is investigated to trace the hidden work of the network, that is, the complexity of actions, practices and discourses that translate stability. How assemblages hold particular entities as static, authoritative and impermeable is the work of ANT.

In some instances, the MOU is absolute, a definite requirement for the development and unfolding of action: research, funding, exchanges, student safety are all brought into possibility through the signing of the MOU, as one participant indicated, "they define the relation and make work possible". The ways in which the MOU could lead to further funding and partnership opportunities were known to many participants. That is, they knew that the visible enrolling of the MOU signified an institutional recognition – that funds would be attributed, such as the circumstance whereby the Dean would sign to denote commitment to funds, or that the research relationship between partners would be noticed by influential actors, such as the ambassador or consulate. Indeed, the MOU was deemed as significant when it was visible.

Law (2009) suggested that *material durability* was one means by which actors held connections in networks to form stabilize relations and entities. He argued that material durability could be achieved through the creation of things such as formalized documents, policy statements and organizational structures. The concern here is the way in which the material orders interactions. As a means of creating material durability, the

MOU provided a material durable relationship. It institutionally connected actors in visible terms: the partnership becomes known and, consequently, becomes legitimate by being known, meaning other funds become enrolled in the networks of this partnership.

Yet in other instances, the MOU is cast aside, seen as a bureaucratic activity that takes time away from doing good work. As one participant stated, "you don't need an MOU to have a partnership". In one sense, the participants described the possibility of an MOU as non-existent in these scenarios. Here, participants talked about how MOUs were unnecessary, frivolous and time-consuming, as though they were unrelated to ensuring the work of research partnerships. However, even though the MOU does not exist as a visible actor in these partnerships, it is evident that it still worked to regulate the conditions of possibility through the connections that were deemed possible or not. Indeed, the MOU, though invisible, mediated the relationships, relegating certain partnership to the periphery, showing certain partnerships were not central to the work of the university.

In addition to material durability, Law (2009) theorized *strategic durability* to include the broad "ordered patterns of relations" (p. 148) involved in the practices by which systems and connections are made. The decisions to sign or not sign an MOU were described in these contexts as strategic. Indeed, a partnership did not even need to exist beyond the MOU, such as the instance whereby an agreement would be signed with a prestigious university president. In those instances, the MOU would be enrolled to bring about a relationship, to create relationship or connection exists between the parties, or to tend it, as one participant suggested when stating, "never sign without an expiry date".

The determination of when an MOU is signed was not consistent or certain from the participants' descriptions of its importance. Yet, its power is dependent on the multiple performances, on creating uncertainty of when it will be visible and other times in which appears absent even as it creates the conditions in which connections can be established. In ANT terms, the MOU functioned as a mediator (Latour, 2005), circulating through the network of actors assembled around internationalization to "transform, distort and modify the meaning" (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, p. 11) of what it means to form a partnership. The meaning of partnerships changed in different instances as the MOU was used as both a tool of legitimation and a tool of exclusion. Even though the document was often deemed as an apolitical tool that seemed punctualized, fixed and stable (Latour, 2005), it can be seen rather as something fluid, something which actors "tinker" in order to make it work. Through the various manifestations in the participants' ways of describing what it does, the MOU in these networks is fluid, generating an ordering of what comes to be performed through internationalization.

So, the enrolment of the MOU is political; the realities of the MOU are considered both relational and performed, suggesting a politics of power inherent in the things that come to exist (Mol, 1999; 2010). The formalized process of enrolling the Provost and the central university international offices to be involved in signing the MOU becomes a means for creating legitimacy for the agreements. Deans provide funding support and resources; the Provost and other central administration participate in official signings that assert certain projects as legitimate for building institutional reputation and prestige; the embassy is enrolled to bring in external and international legitimacy. As one participant who works in central administration stated, "[Our role is] very important with

international relations, it's like DFAIT, right? We are DFAIT of the university. So, you have to deal with diplomatic issues" (Participant 10).

The influence of New Public Management (NPM) reforms in the public sector, including higher education institutions are based on the rise of the administrative class at the expense of a declining professionalism (Blackmore & Sachs, 2007; Olssen & Peters, 2005). Such shifts are inherent in the institutionalization of neoliberal agendas and processes, bringing a clash between the administration and the professional. Professionalism, argued Olssen & Peters, privileges "subject-directed power" based on the autonomy, rights, freedoms and expertise of the individual. Central here is the capacity and value given to the subject's ability for decision-making; there is no neutrality but rather a privileging of the professional. However, neoliberal environments, the scholars contended, reject the professional class as powerful in institutions. While neoliberalism advantages the individual, Olssen & Peters argued that this is always done through the positive interventions of the state. Consequently, neoliberalism demands the individual to be managed through contracts requiring "compliance, monitoring and accountability" (p. 325). The MOU is performed as such: contracts that monitor not only the rules of engagement in defining the relations between actors and but also entities that make the work possible, as one participant articulated.

Yet, as Mol (2010) stated, "a strategist may be inventive, but no one acts alone" (p. 257). The MOU allows space for the agency of the administrative class to be the face of decision-making. The ability to act is dependent on what is located around actors (Mol, 2010b) and the MOU enrolled into the works of the administrator in the management of research, bringing about actions from administrators that at a glance appear removed

from projects – they are not researchers, funders, assistants or experts on the projects themselves. Deciding which partnerships require an MOU goes beyond the immediacy of creating a single project. It is the actor-network of the MOU-administrator granting and denying that operates to bring about power. The power enacted for the MOU-administrator to make decisions renders the work of the professional researcher to the background, a necessary step argued Olssen and Peters for the "managed research" of the neoliberal university.

The politics in the relationships between various actors, the MOU and the subsequent research partnerships require the MOU to function in the many capacities prescribed. Yet, no matter how the MOU is performed, the ways in which the MOU sets actors to work designate its power in the network. Clearly, the MOU is not a benign document. In the network, it becomes more than a symbolic artifact but is a key player in the formation, or not, of the relationships in an international partnerships. Both of these functions are important: to bring together or to deny other actors into the network. The MOU is not only powerful for the way in which other actors are enrolled, but also in the way that it deems some projects not worthy of an MOU. Its power of association is maintained throughout because of both responses set out different realities of the research partnerships. These performances are multiple, not only perspectives, as they perform different realities.

This is not to suggest that partnerships and research programs connecting international partners without MOUs were not worthwhile or even hugely successful at enrolling funding and other supports. Rather, the point here is to show the MOU was able to conceal the process of translation itself, in turning a network of heterogeneous set of

"bits and pieces each with its own inclination" into something that passes as a final entity. That is, the MOU is not a single, fixed document; it is performed through many actions, deeds, and decisions. The significance in the multiplicity of performance is that it allows for seeing the importance of the everyday, mundane aspects (Latour, 2005) of partnership work. It brings forth the capacity to see that connections in the networks around internationalization are forged not only in the momentous experiences of receiving large funding grants, but also in seemingly simple acts of signing and not signing.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I focused on Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) that were central in different capacities in internationalization work. I showed that these texts were not a single object for study but rather objects multiple that were performed in the relations between different actors. While MOUs may be seen as finalized, fixed documents, moments in which signatures gather on a page and disappear into file cabinets, I showed how they are performed through many actions and decisions. The multiplicity of performance shows that connections in the networks around internationalization are forged in the simple acts of decision-making over what projects come to be enrolled through MOUs. I draw on Latour's (1986) notion of power, that the act of defining what holds everyone together is where power is generated, to argue that the multiplicity of the MOU is what makes it powerful in assembling how internationalization work is performed.

Chapter Five: Proposal for Funding as Policy Actor

A proposal for funding emerged as key policy, enrolling different actors from across scalar locations. In this chapter, I discuss the enrolling of different actors in an international research project through the engagement of a proposal for funding and the interactions of this document with different actors in the network, such as university strategic plans, international organizations and the institutional knowledges that actors contribute. Here, I draw mainly on data collected through an interview with one participant, a professor in a health science related field who learned recently that his proposal for funding with a large Canadian institution had been granted a substantial amount of funding. I also draw upon interview data collected with other participants, namely a central senior administrator working in the university's central office for internationalization and a professor in a social science field who also works in administration related to internationalization in his faculty. Additionally, these interview data are triangulated with observation notes from meetings of the advisory council for internationalization at the university and with researcher notes written after each interview and observation session. After showcasing the data, I discuss the role proposals for funding played in enrolling different knowledges as legitimate into the policy network and what comes to be performed through such enrolments.

Proposals Enrolling More than Actors: Knowledges in the Network

During interviews with one professor and director of an office related to international work in the community engagement division within a faculty at the university, a proposal for funding emerged as an important actor in internationalization. I

came to interview this participant because this professor is well known on campus as being involved with internationalization work, both in research and service.

This proposal centered prominently in how the professor talked about internationalization work at the university. The proposal for a research project was successful in that it had recently received a large sum from the Canadian government and over one million dollars from the university for in-kind contributions, such as the research and fieldwork contributions of professors and students. The proposal was submitted to a federal government agency in response to a call for proposals from Canadian universities for projects contributing to the reduction of poverty in the global south.

This professor spoke at length in the interviews about the proposal process since the fieldwork aspects of the project had not yet begun. The timing of project was an interesting context in which to explore the role of policies in networks focused on internationalization because the interactions between university strategies for internationalization and the proposal writing process were something that this professor highlighted. The recent announcement of funding from the federal government agency played a central role in how the participant described the networks this professor was involved with related to internationalization.

This participant elaborated on the importance of the proposal for funding for this project in preparation for the submission to a federal government call for proposals. This professor was the project lead and was instrumental in writing the proposal. This professor came to the project through personal research interests related to the focus of the project, as well as past experience living in the target country in Africa. This

professor elaborated on how working and living in the country previously was advantageous for working with different organizations in this country.

> I spent three years teaching at [a university] and working with the [Canadian federal ministry related to this field of practice] … and then carried on a kind of substantial interest and connection to [this country in East Africa] in many ways and over many years so when I arrived here there was sort of a natural fit. [Participant 11]

The professor noted several times in the interviews that the Canadian university strategies play an integral role in the process of developing the proposal for this project, and other projects being worked on, as well. Stating, "everything we do in proposals always has to work in the larger/broader framework," this professor elaborated that the university's interests in global citizenship and internationalization were key to the success of the proposal in receiving funding both from the university and from external sources. This professor specifically referred to university strategies as being "educative in nature", stating that they teach us about the priorities of the institution, the types of projects that will receive funding, and the goals and aims of the university (Researcher's field notes from interview). Also, this participant regularly attended the speeches given periodically throughout the academic year by the university president, stating, "Because if [the president] says something that's relevant to my work, I'll quote it [in proposal documents]." The proposal for funding in this project itself included references to the university's priorities for internationalization and the institutional structures that are in place, led by senior administration at the university, to support these priorities.

In talking about his process for writing the proposal, this participant stressed the importance of the university administration support in bringing the proposal application

to fruition. This participant mentioned the administration, such as the university president and provost, providing clear guidance for internationalization in the university strategies (Researcher's notes) but also the support from the university central internationalization office to provide grant-writing services.

> I have to say that one of the first things that really astounds at [this university] is for the very senior level of administrative support for globalization and for internationalization of the university and for fostering these types of programs. I've mentioned we've already received funding just from the university's money for [projects in other countries], but we also had the very strong influence from the [university international offices] in the proposal development stage whereby they actually hired a consultant who worked together with me, personally with me on the development of the proposal. And it was essential. Not only was the timeframe so short that I had been given to do the proposal but pulling together everything was just an immense task and I had only been at the university for one or two months, so this person, this consultant, really made a contribution. [Participant 11]

Later, this participant reiterated that the support from senior administration lies both in the production of formalized policy documents and, following from there, financial support.

> And it worked, so it was very, so the senior administrative level was important for two reasons. One was for their policies on globalization, internationalization, I think that's the word that they use mostly here. And, also, then in direct resource support for putting the proposal together. That was, both are just essential. One is essential just to stimulate and motivate people and provide the legitimate space for us to do this type of work, but also in terms of whether they would sign off on [over a] million-dollar contribution for a university. [Participant 11]

While the university central international office was involved in this project through sponsoring a grant writer to work with this professor in developing the proposal, its enrolment into the network was controversial. Though the proposal was successful in bringing over a few million dollars in grant funding to the project, this contribution was seen as benefitting some areas of the university and not others. At a meeting in which representatives from faculties, student organizations and university central international offices gather each term to advise the senior administration on issues of international engagement, the professor announced the successful application for this project's proposal. While this professor openly acknowledged the contribution of support from the international office in providing grant writing services for the proposal, one senior administrator from the international office queried the ability to provide such supports in the future because of the significant cost of doing so to the international office (Researcher's field notes).

However, this stated position sat in tension with how a senior administrator described internationalization at the university. In talking about the role of the central international office, the administrator stated, "[This office] doesn't do internationalization. The university does internationalization. We have a role in facilitating it. We don't own it; the university owns it" [Participant 1].

Also controversial was the idea of who gets to do the internationalization work. The process of enrolling actors involved both inclusion and exclusion of actors. The professor spoke about a situation that occurred during the proposal writing whereby another colleague was asked not to remain on the project team, due to differences in vision. In this brief section of the interview, this participant reflected on the political

nature of the proposal. In another instance, this participant commented on how being involved in consulting on the proposal had influenced one of the team members even before the project began, enrolling more than his interest in the research project but also influencing his teaching practices.

> So, one of the key persons of my team is a very senior [practitioner at a local hospital] and just due to the fact that this process has taken so long, he has become quite a vocal advocate for the project [related to the project's topic]. Whereas before he didn't really have that and it wasn't on his mind and it wasn't strong in his experience base. But now that he's doing his teaching and stuff, he's even talking to the [students in his field] about the new project and he showed a very interesting new film the other day to his class of a hundred and eighty students. And I'm not sure whether he would have done that before the involvement in this project, [even at the proposal writing stage] because the project kind of makes you think a little bit differently and makes you think about other things. (Participant 11)

Again, this statement resonated with how this professor described the instructive nature of proposals and other documents in university settings. They teach about what is important, what matters in the "real world of the research" (Researcher's reflective journal).

In talking about being lead on this project, this professor also provided details about how the writing of the proposal provided opportunity to connect with national and international level actors. At the national level, this participant identified the role of the federal government, through the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) and Ministry of International Cooperation creating "a policy framework" that

enabled the goals of this research project to hold a legitimate space in the networks related to internationalization.

> We're also benefitting from [the federal government in] Canada, and the sort of senior level policy level, making a conscious policy decision to focus on [this topic of research]. Even our Prime Minister has spoken out about it and, apparently from Minister Ambrose this morning, they just had a cabinet meeting and with her new colleague, Julian Fantino, whose is the Minister of International Cooperation. Apparently he himself is now totally moved to and committed to focusing on [these] issues, but particularly [these issues] worldwide. So, that's very motivating also and so hopefully more resources will continue to flow to other universities and other players, and to us more in the future. So, that level of support is very important in terms of creating the policy framework for us to be legitimate, but also that tells their employees [at CIDA and in the Canadian embassies] that this is important and so we get the assistance of them even in the field in [this African country] already.

This professor also elaborated on the process for connecting with actors located in the physical location in which this project will take place, as this participant travelled to this country in Africa and consulted with different actors who could be affiliated with the research project there. In this next quote, this participant spoke about interactions with CIDA staff and their connections to the "political level" in this country.

> I visited with them in April or May, so we had another meeting and because they live there, they're very knowledgeable and sort of know a few things that our partners there don't know because they're connected at the political level. [This country in Africa] is a country of huge investment by all western countries in terms of aid. It's a favorite country. [Participant 11]

These Canadian actors located abroad also provide support in coordinating how Canadian organizations interact with local organizations in this country. From this participant's perspective, organizations like CIDA and DFAIT are very valuable in contributing local knowledge in how to engage with the partners in the field during the implementation side of the project, as he referred to it.

> They have staff in [this African country] who help coordinate the different Canadian interventions in the country and so they do provide some support. Not only might they be knowledgeable in the area of [the project] but they also are knowledgeable about the local scene and all the other actors involved in our particular field. So, they've already helped to insert us into some networks in [this country in East Africa], though we haven't really followed up too much on it because we haven't started the project yet, but they will be very helpful. So, it's kind of a combination between CIDA and the Department of Foreign Affairs, people at the Embassy. But that's very important. So, that's for the implementation side. That's where various different types of level will be very important, not only for the resources to do it. [Participant 11]

However, the actual proposal document itself does not list CIDA, DFAIT or Canadian embassy staff as potential project partners in the project. In fact, the only reference to this level of organization is through the mentioning of a brief session held at the Canadian embassy as a consultation process. In this way, while these organizations were very valuable to the proposal writing process in contributing "local knowledge", they remain hidden at this point without the act of tracing the different actors in the network, in this case, by talking to the people involved in writing the proposal.

In contrast to what appears on the proposal, this professor suggested that local staff located in the field of practice related to this project contributed a different

knowledge base. In the consultation trip to this country during the proposal writing process, many individuals and organizations were consulted about the project and these are listed clearly on the proposal. These actors include universities, federal ministries and practitioner associations related to the field of practice, and several large-scale international organizations such as Save the Children, United Nations Population Fund and the World Health Organization. The knowledge base that these organizations contributed was important to this participant, and this professor stressed the significance of their enrolment at the proposal stage, not merely in the "implementation phase". This consultation process at the inception of the project allowed for actors who work "on the ground" every day in this country to provide input into how the project should be designed from the start. This professor detailed the personal significance of this contribution.

> … and what was different [when] I got the feedback from our partners was that when I was putting the proposal together, I went to [this African country] very early on [for] my part of it and I listened. I just asked people, "What are the major issues?" you know. [The two associations related to this field of practice in this African country]. I said, "Where, what should we do?" I didn't come and say, "I already know the situation, here's what we're going to do." I had some ideas in particular because I had lived there for three years and I knew the situation relatively well. And I have been working, doing this for a long time, but I just went and I listened and then I wrote the proposal according to their suggestions. (Participant 11)

This participant suggested that the input from the partners in the other country were significant in how the project was conceptualized. Certainly, their knowledge of the problem in the local context was influential. However, this

participant also indicated that their input was instrumental in the proposal's success.

> And I fully believe that is also what has made us successful because we have come up with unique strategies for dealing with problems that have been around forever basically. [The topic of this project] has been an issue of humankind forever and it's still a huge problem. It's a huge problem in [this country in Africa] where twenty five thousand [people are affected every year from this problem]. Yeah, and in Canada, much less. It's almost doesn't exist. It's almost non-existent and, yet, there, every single day almost close to a hundred [people are affected]. Yeah, it's a huge human rights issue in my thinking. So, we listened to them and we came up with two very unique strategies that we hope that will be successful. We feel quite confident that they will be, but you know, we'll wait and see. So, all these different levels are really important. [Participant 11]

In talking about meetings involving one association of practitioners and an arm of the UN, this professor proposed that their interactions brought a reality to the proposal.

> … they told me the real situation and they told me what the real problems were from their perspective and then they told me what the parameters, what they would recommend as the parameters for the scope of the project. And I learned over the years, you listen to people when you get that kind of advice because at the end of the day, and really I've been doing this for over thirty years, and I still know and believe that at the end of the day I do not really know what's going on in a lot of places. [Participant 11]

This consultative process that proceeded and informed the proposal was held with both Canadian and international partners, bringing together their knowledge bases into the proposal, and consequently for this participant, into the project from its inception.

> And what's ultimately very important and I think which was a major factor in helping us get this project was the strong foundation we built on the ground in [this African country] with partners there, just like we did with [other universities in Canada]. The building of the partnership and team in [this African country] was also of crucial importance because I know they were contacted and asked in the evaluation [from the federal granting agency]. [Participant 11]

Other participants in the study also spoke about funding proposals as key actors in their internationalization work. Another participant wrestled with the tensions that exist in partnerships and reflected that proposals for funding are inherently international in contemporary academic contexts. Though not involved with the above proposal, another professor spoke generally about his role working in administration related to internationalization in his faculty. He was a professor as well as administrator, bringing several years of international work to his practice. In his administrative role in the faculty, this participant is involved with a process of vetting calls for proposals, to facilitate international projects in research and teaching, "imagining across the faculty proposal X to do project Y" (Participant 18). He spoke specifically about proposals from CIDA bringing together actors from different sectors that might not otherwise choose to work together. He said, "We're tied to Ministries of Education, we're tied to non-governmental organizations and we're tied to other universities. And that simply creates a kind of synthesis that wouldn't have existed without that call for the proposal." Yet, he also talked about how the proposals bring about a shift in how people think about their own work in relation to others and the tensions that exist in the coming together of different knowledge bases when partners begin to think about working together. In this

lengthy quote, this participant reflects on how the call for proposals has a way of shaping how international work comes to be defined.

> What would that look like? How would I put people together here with other people, you know, what would that network look like and what's the capacity to do it? And it also reinforces the search that you do. Yeah, and it also reinforces the research that you do, in a lot of cases the proposals that you respond to reflect your area of expertise or, you know, of the particular faculty members area of expertise. So, it builds their own research agenda, builds their own research portfolio and connects them through the people they might not have thought initially about being connected. And it's particularly because the development issue ties the global north and global south, the links that get created move us out of the European paradigm of institutional research. You know, engage you with issues that are issues on the ground that allow you to bring to bear your own work, but to bring to bear in particular cultural contexts with other actors with other partners who have their own perspectives about what international work should look like. So, it ends up being a very interesting conversation and a negotiation and it's tied to cultural attitudes, it's tied to deep set perceptions of things like what research is, what the outcomes of a particular project might be and then that has to conform with government typically, government perspectives, as well. How do they match your project? [Participant 18]

This participant highlighted the tensions that exist when different actors come together, as he noted that actors bring with them particular assumptions, cultures and perspectives that interact. The notion that "negotiation" is needed between actors was something that he often reflected during the interview. In one place, he talked about the "hidden" aspects of internationalization work and the struggle to identify what is driving it.

> Ultimately the deeper question needs to be asked about the sort of hidden curriculum and what the default is and the driver. You can speak about these issues, but ultimately if you're driven effectively by government policy or central administration policy that really dictates the direction, to what degree are you actually having a real role [in] how that plays itself out? So, that's the uncomfortable part. Everybody's wise enough not to say we're just in it for the money, folks, but are they really in it for the money? [Participant 18]

For this participant, this tension was a constant aspect of engaging in internationalization in higher education as he recognized the politics inherent in bringing together different actors.

Analysis: Performing Knowledges

The pervasive influence of neoliberalism in public policy results in the privileging of market-based principles in the transactions of daily life (Harvey, 2005). In such conditions, education is viewed as a commodity and is structured so that it can be controlled through principles of marketization, affecting the daily working of higher education institutions (Olssen, 2004). Consequently, the institutional technologies of higher education rely on products that can be measured and appraised within market-based approaches. It is in this rationality that we see the importance for proposals for funding and their ability to attract high levels of money for research and partnerships.

Proposals for funding are inherently focused on revenue generation. It is not a surprise that a proposal would involve funding opportunities and other forms of support from the university and other actors. It is reasonable to conceive of proposals for funding involving many different revenue-generating sources: researchers, goals and measurable outcomes, metrics for measuring success, and sources of funding. However, the

interviews with two professors and the observations in the university level meeting show how the network that is gathered around the proposal is more complex. The insights offered from these participants propose challenges to how we think about proposals as straightforward funding mechanisms.

As a sensibility towards research (Mol, 2010), ANT analyses focus on the interactions between people and things as networks, or assemblages, that produce practices and knowledge. The focus in ANT research takes us away from actors as individuals towards *interaction* (Cordella & Shaikh, 2006, p. 9). Attention is drawn to the work of these assemblages, whereby the interaction between people and things produce particular effects emerging from networks of interests and actions (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, p. 131). Realities are considered relational and performed, but never final, suggesting a politics of power inherent in the things that are performed (Mol, 1999; 2010a).

Interactions are key in ANT in order to trace the assembly, and reassembly, of actions, actors and interests that produce what is authoritative and powerful. Such interactions, offered Latour (2005), involve processes that aim for stability. The ways in which stability is achieved remain invisible in the activity of daily life yet through the tracing of interactions between actors, the networks that black-box or hide this assembly and reassembly become visible. As Law (1992) stated, "we might ask how some kinds of interactions more or less succeed in stabilizing and reproducing themselves: how it is that they overcome resistance and seem to become 'macrosocial'" (p. 380). Understanding how assemblages hold particular knowledges as static, authoritative and impermeable is the work of ANT.

By looking at the proposal, it may seem an object as a fait accompli, a singular, final product. In ANT terms, the proposal may be viewed as a *punctuation* (Law, 1992), standing in place as a simple actor that black-boxes the heterogeneous network of interactions between many different actors: between funding opportunities, calls for proposals, institutional strategies and priorities, actors located the local university setting and those that are geographically distanced from the university (CIDA and embassy staff, practitioners working in the field in what is the local context of the research project site). When viewed from this perspective, the proposal can be seen as part of the network that forms the social relation between these different actors. The proposal is not just the work of the sole professor alone, rather the process of writing the proposal, in bringing it into being, mediated the social relations between many actors, some close within the institution and others that were far removed in another continent.

The professor who wrote the grant spoke about the educative nature of the university's international strategies, as they taught about the priorities of the institution, the types of projects that will receive funding, and the goals and aims of the university (Researcher's field notes from interview). Also, this participant regularly attended the speeches given periodically throughout the academic year by the university president, stating, "Because if [the president] says something that's relevant to my work, I'll quote it [in proposal documents]." The proposal for funding in this project itself included references to the university's priorities for internationalization and the institutional structures that are in place to support these priorities. Another participant reflected that the call for proposals influences the "search for [research partners] and the research that you do." This administrator also talked about how there was synergy in bringing together

different people into the internationalization work and how this came to define the internationalization work that is completed. These participants reflected that there was a learning process involved in interacting with these texts.

Participants suggested there was an educative aspect to policies, suggesting that these participants envisioned policy knowledge within those texts that was relevant to the internationalization work that comes to be performed. This knowledge shapes the way internationalization itself plays out in the specific context. Such understanding requires a view of knowledge that emerges from interaction. The notion of knowledge in ANT is not reflective of knowledge transfer, but rather that knowledge is an effect of the interactions in networks. While knowledge may take material forms (Law, 1992), knowledge involves action, "a matter of organising and ordering those materials" (p. 381). Learning and knowledge are not properties of individual actors (Nespor, 1994). Rather, "'learning' should refer to changes in the spatial and temporal organization of the distributed actors/networks that we're always part of. …we move through different spatio-temporal distributions of knowing" (p. 11). The knowledge contained in the grant was up for dispute as there were contradictions between what the professor deemed as important and what the senior administrator saw as essential. The end goal was the same – to receive external funding through the grant proposal application process. However, the knowledge that emerged through each perspective was not the same. One focused on the collective knowledge that emerges through partnerships, the other on the technical knowledge of grant writing.

Nespor suggested that the assemblages of actors that are brought together around knowledge are constitutive of the power that comes to define these actors. He elaborated,

"'communities' are not just situated *in* space and time, they are ways of *producing and organizing* space and time and setting up patterns of movement across space-time: they are networks of power. People don't simply move into these networks in an apprenticeship mode, they are defined, enrolled and mobilized along particular trajectories that move them across places in a network and allow them to move other parts of the world into that network" (Nespor, 1994, p. 9). These assemblages are fluid and contested and act as "frameworks of power" (p. 9). In this context, engaging with policies has the effect of change, in re-assembling the networks that form around that policy. In this case, where are the moments of re-assembling?

The professor in charge of the project spent much time developing this proposal, but what comes to be performed through the proposal is not through his efforts alone. The proposal presents itself as a final entity, but it involved a myriad of actions in order to sustain it as such. The professor spoke about the interactions between different actors as the proposal took form. For example, the international office at the university provided financial support for the grant writer. Yet, this international office is an actor in tension. On the one hand, there was support for this international project, both through funds to hire the grant writer and also through policy support in which internationalization work was openly advocated for and determined as important work in the university. In this sense, there was policy knowledge that contributed to the proposal as it took its shape, a knowledge for internationalization premised on building relationships with international partners. In doing so, the proposal acted as a way of bringing together the work of the international office and the work of the project. Yet, the senior administrator responsible for the international office openly expressed the priority for money making opportunities

for this office, sitting in conflict with how this professor spoke about the goals for the project from the researcher's perspective. There are competing knowledges at play: forming international partnerships focused on research with specific goals in tension with the purpose for revenue generation for the university in terms of external grant funding. The competing views of what counts as important in internationalization are mediated through the proposal as it takes shape as different actors are introduced.

Material durability relies on physical form to hold shapes and relationships (Law, 2009). Material durability in organizations, for example, can be achieved through the creation of things such as formalized documents, policy statements and organizational structures. The concern here is the way in which the material orders interactions. The stability and punctuation of internationalization is seen as it is entrenched in material form in policies such as university strategic plans and statements of priority areas for funding. However, the way in which this professor brought in the "local" knowledge through the proposal shows that these institutional strategies do not stand alone as the only knowledge for how internationalization should be performed. Rather, the way in which this professor spoke about the importance of bringing the "local" knowledge of the field into the project at the proposal writing stage was a moment in which the knowledge for internationalization shifted from solely focusing on the university's strategic plans in order to enroll the needs and priorities of the project members located in the far away location of the project country. In this sense, the proposal brings these two institutional contexts together even though they are separated through a geographical distance. The consequence of this enrolment is that internationalization shifts from a rationality of economics (money-making for the university) to collaborations focused on the needs of

the "local" people in another context. The shift is subtle, but offers a moment in which we see how the proposal is not a benign document as it involves potentials for shifting what counts as knowledge.

Finally, the notion of local knowledge emerges as a fluid entity. The professor spoke about local knowledge from the people located in the country where this project will be carried out and the importance of gaining this knowledge for both the working of the project, but also for creating legitimate conditions for funding with CIDA. The notion of local is troublesome here: what constitutes local knowledge? Is it the knowledges brought forth from the people with whom the project will be carried out in this African country? Certainly there would be a multiplicity of knowledge contributions from these people, rather than a single contribution. Is it that of Canadian embassy or CIDA workers in the region? These are Canadian actors by nationality and by institution, yet they work in a foreign country located outside the borders of Canadian societies. What about the university central international office? This office is local if considered in close proximity to the professor. Nespor (1994) explored the world of texts as creating discursive realities, rather than merely providing descriptive qualities to reality. He questioned, "Does the text 'describe' [actors]? It *creates* them, *constitutes* them (and me), not as fixed essences…but as 'contestable and constrained stories' (Hathaway, 1989)" (Nespor, 1994, p. 10). The ways in which the identity of local is both assigned and assumed by actors through the activities of the proposal are means of creating the actors as important and meaningful to the project. The proposal as a text draws these actors in, as Latour (2005) reminds us that tracing networks shows how actors are connected, no matter their physical distance. Locations of local and global are performed by what connects actors.

Each of the actors involved in the proposal drew upon other policy knowledges in carrying out their work so the boundaries are blurred in what is local. Embassy officials, practitioners and ministry officials in the partnering country are enrolled as local, meaning essential, in the ways their knowledges define the project through the proposal. These actors are deeply embedded in the project, rather than periphery actors.

There are other means by which internationalization is performed through involvement with the proposal. Strategic durability includes the broad "ordered patterns of relations" (Law, 2009, p. 148) involved in the practices by which systems and connections are made. Law suggested that in paying attention to strategy, the concern should not be only with human intentionality but rather the practices that create durable networks. One of the colleagues of the professor interviewed in this project talked about how working on the proposal has changed his teaching – brought the far flung world of the research context in another content into the teaching that happens here at the Canadian university, long before the traditional phase of "implementation" began. Yet, in a way, this small act is one example of how the implementation has already begun, ideas are changing, teaching practices shifting, as actors engage with knowledges that are enrolled from afar. In another case, one person who was originally enrolled into the project during the proposal writing stage was asked to leave the project, due to tensions in the vision of the work. The strategic moves to either entrench or dissolve the practices of internationalization through involvement in the proposal show the fluidity by which internationalization work is achieved in various mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion. Indeed, the proposal acted as a mediator of both inclusion and exclusion in these cases as the project had not yet begun. As Nespor (1994) indicated, assemblages are fluid and act

as “frameworks of power” (p. 9). The processes of inclusion and exclusion that happen as actors are strategically enrolled and excluded are moments in which we see the power of the assemblage at play.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I discuss the enrolling of different actors in an international research project through the engagement of a proposal for funding and the interactions of this document with different actors in the network, such as university strategic plans, international organizations and the institutional knowledges that actors contribute. I discussed the role proposals for funding played in enrolling different knowledges as legitimate into the policy network and what comes to be performed through such enrolments. Both material and strategic durabilities were explored as essential means by which knowledges were included and excluded through the work of the proposal. Yet these durabilities are fluid, as Nespor (1994) indicated, assemblages act as “frameworks of power” (p. 9). The processes of inclusion and exclusion that happen as actors are strategically enrolled and excluded are moments in which we see the power of the assemblages that form around proposals for funding at play.

Chapter Six: Policy Statements/Position Papers Related to Internationalization as Policy Actor

The most complex network that I traced in the data collection was the network that emerged around internationalization policy statements and position papers related to immigration, trade and the marketing of international education. The complexity of this network showed the multiplicity of performances that ANT analyses aim to explore. In this section, I describe the policy networks assembled around two documents from two national organizations: 1) Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade's (DFAIT)[1] report, *International Education: A Key Driver of Canada's Economic Prosperity,* commonly called "The Chakma Report" referring to Amit Chakma, President of Western University who chaired the report's committee, and 2) the Council of the Federation's (COF) report, *Bringing Education in Canada to the World, Bringing the World to Canada: An Internationalization Marketing Action Plan for Provinces and Territories.* These two texts were referred to by several participants in data collected, both through interview and observation of meetings. In considering these policies as actors, I sought to trace their connections in the network of internationalization as it was performed in different spaces.

In this chapter, I describe the ways that university and provincial level actors translated these policies into practice, as different actors, both human and non-human, were enrolled into the networks formed around these policies. Translation describes what

[1] After data collection was completed in this project, DFAIT was restructured by the federal government and renamed the Department for Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada (DFATD). While this change may be significant to how international education and internationalization processes are assembled within this ministry, such changes are beyond the scope of this project and require further study.

happens when things connect, changing one another and forming links (Latour, 1987). An important distinction in the notion of translation is that we are talking about process, "the work of making two things that are not the same, equivalent" (Law, 1999, p. 8). As such, focusing on this process calls attention to the generation of "ordering effects such as devices, agents, institutions or organizations" (Law, 2003, p. 5). While diffusion is used in many institutional theories to explain the movement of an object through space and time, the notion of translation "emphasizes the changes that occur in meanings and interpretations as a physical or social object moves through a network" (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006, p. 67).

The networks assembled around these documents involve national, provincial and local university actors that illustrate the complexity of ways in which internationalization comes to be performed in the Canadian context. In describing the networks, I show how internationalization is enrolled with immigration and trade through interactions with these policy statements and discuss the spaces in which the relations between actors are maintained, shifted and negotiated in the interactions between these internationalization performances.

I aim to show competing efforts to frame internationalization in two national policy documents. Such framing is not singular (Jolivet & Heiskanen, 2010); the performative realities of internationalization in the ways these texts are enrolled into spaces of internationalization are multiple. In the discussion that follows, I examine how these multiple framings are produced through the discursive practices in the text and the material practices in the ways actors translate the policy into their organizations. Furthermore, I show how the ways in which these policies enroll practices related to

immigration and citizenship, as well as marketing and economic priorities, are controversial for university actors. The competing efforts of framing internationalization not only shape what it means, but also how internationalization is practiced and how actors are privileged as agential and powerful in internationalization processes. Indeed, as Anne-Marie Mol (2010) suggested realities do not necessarily merely sit side by side, but often co-existent. It is this multiple reality that provided tensions for university actors.

I begin by looking at the two documents: the COF Plan and the Advisory Panel's report (Chakma Report) to DFAIT. In describing each policy text, I look at interview data collected from participants across levels and document analysis to consider the heterogeneous network that assembles around each policy. In the section that follows, I examine the competing efforts between the networks to frame internationalization. In this analysis, I suggest that the controversies, that is competitions to frame and enroll other actors, enacts attempts to re-work the relationships between actors engaged in higher education, noting the struggles to dominate the defining of who is powerful and what is legitimate in internationalization. This first section focuses on the controversies between the Chakma Report and the COF plan themselves. However, in the subsequent section, I present data to show the university becomes wrapped up in these controversies and how their enrolment assembles different actors and interests. Consequently, in the analysis section, I discuss how internationalization presents not as a single entity but rather as an object multiple (Mol, 2010b), suggesting there are ontological politics at play in how internationalization policy is enacted across levels of engagement.

The COF Plan

The COF document, *Bringing education in Canada to the world: Bringing the world to Canada*, was released in June 2011. The byline of the title tagged the document as "a response to the council of the federation from provincial and territorial ministers of education and of immigration". The Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) in collaboration with provincial and territorial ministers of immigration developed the plan to address both international student recruitment and retention in Canada post-graduation from higher education studies. One participant from a national organization remarked on the importance of the pan-Canadian approach in this policy, bridging provincial and pan-Canadian issues.

> So, the Ministers have their Council; they're supported by committee of Deputy Ministers of Education who provide advice on how to bring certain things forward and what issues to take up and this kind of thing. They perform the role that they would perform in their own jurisdiction except in this case, not only considering their own interest but also trying to see the full kind of pan-Canadian scope of things. [Participant 13]

This participant's comments illustrate the focus in the plan on pan-Canadian as opposed to federal issues. That is, internationalization happens through the collective work of the provinces, rather than the national work of the federal government. Indeed, there is recognition in the plan that each provincial and territorial jurisdiction already has strategies underway related to these areas. Consequently, this plan is aimed at complementing these efforts by working individually as provinces, collectively as provincial and territorial areas and nationally with the federal government. While there is recognition within the plan that there are times in which the provincial and territorial ministries will work individually and others at which they may "speak as a combined

voice" (p. 10), there is a marked emphasis on the importance and legitimacy of the province and territory over internationalization efforts. In this text, legitimacy and authority for educational governance is discursively constructed for the provinces and territories.

The idea that the plan was made to support individual provinces in collective action was echoed by one participant from a national organization who described the policy context at the time the plan was developed.

> The [COF] document is a guide to what the provinces think that they can accomplish together that will add to what they're already doing in their jurisdictions. So, if you think back to, I mean, the request for that document came in the summer of 2010 and in the summer of 2010 you've already got a number of provinces that have either laid out explicit plans for promoting their province to the world, the education system in their province to the world. Or in some cases they've created an agency to do that or in some cases they've done both. But then they've also agreed, having spent a number of years doing that kind of thing already, then they've also agreed, you know, what we really need to have a brand that will serve as an umbrella under which we can all fit…[Participant 13]

There are four outcomes listed in the plan: 1) to increase the numbers of international students that study in Canada, 2) to grow Canada's share of the international student market, 3) to develop opportunities for Canadian students to study abroad and 4) to improve the amount of foreign students that remain in Canada as permanent residents. The plan focuses on international education and immigration but also "economic recovery and development, as well as enhanced competitiveness for provinces and territories" (p. 5).

A participant from the provincial government reinforced the work of the premiers coming together on this plan and how it formulated a position statement from these first ministers.

> [The Council of the Federation] directed the provinces to come up an internationalization marketing and promotions initiative. So, the provinces working through CMEC at their table submitted it and it was approved by the Council, the International Education Marketing Plan….And CMEC now will operationalize it, but it was endorsed through the Council so that you're getting at the highest level, the premiers are saying, "These are the broad directions we wish to take in promotion of international education." [Participant 6]

This participant summed up the plan using an unofficial name for it: the International Education Marketing plan. This naming of the plan focused specifically on marketing was later contradicted by this participant in describing the way the plan was put together through the negotiation between the provincial and territorial partners. The outcomes of the plan were something negotiated by the provinces, as there was disagreement by representatives from the provinces about what international education should mean. For this participant from the provincial government, there was a "resetting of the pendulum", that the project of internationalization came to be redefined as the provincial representatives came together to work on the COF plan. This participant described the history of COF: "It traditionally has had more of an economic labour focus and a political focus. It also has moved increasingly to recognize and integrate education into a lot of what it's doing and you can't separate labour work force strategies and education." This participant later went on to describe how there was negotiation between provinces in forming this policy.

> …I think the COF initiative is really, was a bit of a resetting of the pendulum. There were provinces that came to the table and there were policy people that wanted nothing more than a marketing and promotions document from the premiers and some provinces pushed back and said, "No, it's not sustainable." We know that [labour and education have] to be related. We get much more benefit, we'll achieve much more goals. It will allow provinces to address it as they are seeing the priorities on internationalization much more robustly, versus saying here's how you have to be engaged in international education. [Participant 6]

Another participant at the provincial government agreed of the importance of the provincial government to lead internationalization. In talking about the role of the province in working with actors at the university and at the national level, this participant stated, "I definitely see government as playing a direction setting, sort of like higher level planning, sort of strategic policy role" [Participant 5]. This participant talked about the importance of working between ministries in the provincial government, particularly with the international and intergovernmental relations department, adding, "We work with them a lot also on the CMEC file and other sort of international issues because they definitely set the more broad [provincial government] policy on international. And we just deal with the departmental sort of take on that" [Participant 5].

Indeed, this plan reinforces the legitimate right for educational decision-making at the provincial and territorial level. While there is recognition that "efforts to promote Canada's education systems abroad involve multiple actors" (p. 10), the lead for such promotion is placed firmly as the responsibility of provinces and territories. Designated priorities within these jurisdictions are considered central to internationalization efforts within Canada. This firm positioning of education responsibility within provincial parameters is outlined in the plan as a response to calls from "stakeholders'" complaints

of a lack of coordination for education across Canada and subsequent beckoning to the federal government for leadership to do so. One participant from the provincial government addressed this issue.

> International and intergovernmental relations set the broad [provincial government] policy, so we have to make sure we're being consistent and in line, I guess making sure we're just in line, with the broader [provincial government] strategic direction and what not. And it can be, it can serve an advisory role or sometimes we coordinate our response with input from other departments. Just it's more efficient and harmonizing so you know a stakeholder isn't getting three different sort of like similar, but responses from different departments. So we do some coordinating.

This participant was clear that there is a role for the provincial government to communicate priorities and changes between federal actors and other stakeholders, and to show the province's priorities in relation to the work of the federal government, CMEC and COF. This participant expressed the ways national meetings between the federal and provincial governmental ministries were instrumental in bringing together policy interests.

> It's an information sharing and advice seeking mechanism. It's a way for provinces and territories to be in the same room and discuss these policies and discuss them with the federal government. I would see it more of an advice. I want to say advice seeking. I'm not sure if that's the right word, but a forum for discussion on policy issues in terms of international. [Participant 5]

Here, the emphasis on sharing of information is central, as a mechanism such as this "informs policy decisions. It doesn't always move that quickly, but definitely it is a consistent forum for discussing policy, international policy, education policy, in particular, and then feeding it up to the levels of the Deputies and Ministers then at the

Council, or at the CMEC" [Participant 5]. The connections between federal and provincial levels are made through discussions on internationalization.

Furthermore, the COF plan recognizes a federal budget tabled in 2011 to commit $10 million over two years to develop Canada's international strategy, highlighting that this budget failed to be passed and that there was an exclusion of a designated role for provinces and territories in this budget. Consequently, the COF plan suggests a necessary negotiation that is required to manage internationalization, not only at the federal level but also with a strong role for the provinces and territories.

The COF plan does concede clear actions for DFAIT and CIC to work with the provinces, rather than play a leadership role, as provincial and territorial priorities are asserted as essential launching points for international marketing efforts. The plan was developed in collaboration with provincial and territorial ministers in immigration, and appropriately, there is a significant emphasis on actions for CIC in the plan's objectives related to strengthening formal international student programming and to enhancing visa processes in "key markets" (p. 7), balancing the need to "prevent fraudulent entry into Canada with the need to remove obstacles to the entry of legitimate international students" (p. 8). The stated role for DFAIT mentioned in the plan is to work with provinces and territories with the "Education in/au Canada" brand. This brand was needed "so that governments, education institutions and stakeholders could speak to international students using a consistent message that addresses the key influences on international student choice of destination…and highlights Canada in the market" (p. 15). In this plan, the brand is enrolled as a tool for the provinces to invoke in the doing of internationalization.

The Chakma Report

The Chakma Report was released by an advisory panel on Canada's international education strategy in August 2012. The advisory panel consisted of eight members: six members from higher education institutions, including university presidents, chancellors and senior administration from international offices, as well as two corporate members: one member from Rio Tinto Alcan, a Canadian based mining company and another as director of Transat A.T., a large corporation and chancellor emeritus for a Canadian university. The report was authored by the advisory panel and considered the following questions: "Does the world know about Canada's quality, world-class institutions? Are the best and brightest students thinking of Canada as they plan their future?" (DFAIT, 2012, p. i).

There are fourteen recommendations listed in the report for DFAIT formulating a strategy for Canada focused on five themes: 1) identifying targets for success relate to increasing international student levels at Canadian institutions and enhancing opportunities for mobility of domestic students; 2) coordinating policy and ensuring sustainable quality related to mechanisms for internationalization for "quality" in the marketing of education; 3) promoting the "Education in/au Canada" brand with strategic recommendations for how to select priority markets for Canada; 4) investing in scholarships that attract top talent both in and outside Canada; and 5) developing infrastructure and support for study permits and visas through communication between the federal government and the education sector.

Key recommendations through this report include a focus on doubling the international students choosing to pursue higher education in Canada, up to 450,000

students by 2022, and domestic students abroad up to 50,000. There is recognition of costs inherent to this process, suggesting co-funding structures in place between federal government and academic institutions and /or provincial governments. The federal investment "will be matched by institutions and/or provinces and territories and private donors by a 2:1 ratio" (DFAIT, 2012, p. xiii).

Another key recommendation specifically indicates the intention to locate internationalization of education as a priority within federal government policies and plans, stating, "the way forward: the panel sees the Prime Minister as a unifying champion for international education" (DFAIT, 2012, p. 39). International education is deemed as "a pipeline to the Canadian labour market", positioning trade as a key factor of the report's recommendations. There are clear indications in the recommendations to position the federal government as holding responsibility for internationalization of education, in that "the coordination of the international education strategy should stay with DFAIT and its network of embassies and office abroad" and DFAIT should work closely with education associations such as the Canadian Consortium for International Education Marketing (CCIEM), a group of education associations in Canada that is managed by the Canadian Bureau of International Education (CBIE).

One participant noted the involvement of the consortium, commenting that efforts were made in the higher education association sector to work together for advocacy at the federal government level and "to really work in a coherent, collaborative way together over a sustained period of time. It's really been quite a watershed, I would say…in the advocacy and the operationalization of international education in Canada" [Participant

17]. This participant elaborated on how influential this collaborative effort has been on effecting policy:

> It was very significant from the political perspective at the federal level. And, in fact, I think it was our ability to speak with one voice, I think was what resulted in the initial investment the federal government made of ten million dollars over two years and the establishment of the Chakma Panel. So, it has been, I think, quite an important development when a whole sector can work together to be as effective and results-oriented as possible to lead by example … in terms of collaboration and coherence and having a whole sector approach and to speak with one voice in advocacy with government. Those are key advantages. [Participant 17]

Another participant from a different national organization concurred, that the mandate of nationally-based education associations "is really focused on shaping federal policy" [Participant 13]. Indeed, the work of these associations is understood by others in organizations at the national level as having a significant mandate for internationalization: "And we've been able to play a role in receiving, just as an other example, in receiving international delegations and be able to tell a much more understandable and coherent story about the education sector in Canada" [Participant 13].

Acknowledging that education is a provincial jurisdiction, the section on the context of the report from the advisory panel recognizes a role for provincial authorities in quality assurance to "ensure that Canada's reputation for quality education and support of international students is maintained" (DFAIT, 2012, p. 44). There is an association made to the provincial actors with the work of CMEC in this regard, especially related to the Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials (CICIC).

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) is considered a "major collaborative partner" with DFAIT for providing coordination of Canada's international strategy.

Issues related to study and work permits, as well as student and permanent resident visas are elaborated within the realm of CIC's enrolment into the strategy. The role of Canadian embassies in dealing with these aspects is also highlighted.

The enrolment of CIC and DFAIT as central actors in the report positions internationalization as closely tied to international trade and immigration, which brings about marked shifts for the Canadian government's involvement in higher education. One participant from a national level organization commented how the intensity with which the federal government has become interested in higher education is a recent emphasis. This participant has been working in the higher education sector for over 20 years and consequently has come to view these shifts as a "positive development" as governments "tune in" to the economic realities of internationalization.

> I think that one of the interesting developments - particularly if you're looking at a policy development context perspective - is that in the last five to seven years governments have really tuned in to the economic aspects, the economic benefits of internationalization. Like they were, like I've been involved in this field for 20 years, only in this field for 20 years, and you could not get government's attention on this issue ten years ago. And now it is actually at the federal level; it is positioned under the Minister of International Trade. [Participant 17]

The responsibility for institutions to create an atmosphere of a quality experience for the international student, to standardize credit transfer, and to facilitate study abroad, and to promote cultural aspects of international education through global citizenship is positioned as institutional areas of concern. There is a stated focus for institutions to develop "strategic partnerships – institution to institution and person to person – for academic exchange and research innovation" (p. 74). Higher education institutions are

enrolled in this plan as key players for developing the trade agenda through academic and research agendas, aligning the institutions with the federal government's incentives for federal support for internationalization.

Controversies in the Framing of Internationalization: Reworking of Relationships

Participants often described the work of internationalization policies in connecting actors across national, provincial and local university scales. However, the nature of internationalization as it comes to be performed through these interactions was not singular. Rather, the framing of internationalization that emerges in the interactions between actors around these policy statements produce controversies of multiplicity, in that there are "alternate efforts of competing networks of actors to 'frame' the reality and enroll others" (Jolivet & Heiskanen, 2010).

The notion of framing used in ANT goes beyond discursive *interpretations* of reality. In ANT, the stability of relations, which are reality-producing, can be *achieved* through discursive means (Law, 2009). This is the relational ontology of ANT. Framing is not only conceptual but also performative (Jolivet & Heiskanen, 2010) in that "framing devices are used to calculate, predict and constrain material and human behaviours" (p. 6748). In other words, framing is used to order and structure. The stability of what is performed, that is, the reality of internationalization, comes to be negotiated in the ways in which actors interact with these policy statements. My efforts here are to describe "the enactment of materially and discursively heterogeneous relations that produce and reshuffle all kinds of actors" (Law, 2009, p. 141) by looking at the texts and the ways in which actors spoke about their influence.

However, the influences of these texts should be read in the context of the political environments in which they are constructed and enacted. The increasing relations between neoliberalism and higher education in the production of the knowledge economy are prevalent in the ways these texts are institutionalized in university work. Both the provincial pan-Canadian plan and the federal strategy argued for increased role of government in higher education practices for internationalization. Such positioning reflects the way in which neoliberalism requires the positive intervention of the state (Olssen & Peters, 2005) to bring about conditions necessary for economic well-being at the national and provincial levels. The enrolling of these governmental policies into the life of the university ought be taken into account when considering the heterogenous relations of the actors that assemble around internationalization strategies and plans. Consequently, my goal here is to not only describe the relations but to also examine the orderings that these produce (Law, 1992).

Internationalization as provincial power. There is a stated focus repeated throughout the COF Plan on the importance of the provinces and territories working together bi-laterally and collectively with the federal government. By doing so, there is a clear focus to position internationalization of higher education firmly within provincial and territorial jurisdiction. While this reality is protected through federal policies and provincial rights within the Constitution, the emphasis of internationalization as within the jurisdiction of the provinces serves to rework the provincial relations between provinces and with the federal government. One participant confirmed that this was a discursive effect of the strategy in that it created a guide for the way the provincial and territorial jurisdictions envisioned the relationship with the federal government.

> So, I mean the purpose of that document is to guide, over the next few years when the jurisdictions will work on them collectively. It's also a bit of a guide, frankly, to their view on the appropriate relationships with the federal government. I don't know if you've had a chance to read the plan in detail but it must say a hundred times that, you know, we're going to work with the federal government on x, y and z. [Participant 13]

In this case, strategies for internationalization become sites for defining the relationship between these actors. Interests of labor, immigration, and education are enrolled together through internationalization as they relate to broader provincial priorities and goals to foster the governance relationship with the federal government. In this way, the plan that emerges is an effect of this enrolment, and generates "ordering effects" (Law, 2003, p. 5). Consequently, internationalization comes to mean more than international education; it brings about a change in the relationships between provincial and the federal governments. Internationalization in practice is about internationalizing the university campus but also about what happens in governmental relations within Canada, too.

There is much focus on international students and Canadian students, while internationalization creates a relationship between the provinces and students – students are seen as economic actors in internationalization arenas as they contribute over twice the tuition that Canadian students pay through the international student differential fee. One provincial participant recognized this and commented on the tension for institutions to deal with both international and domestic students.

> If it only becomes a business model and it's making money, well you could go to one or two countries, you could probably fill all the seats you could. You could actually start bumping [domestic students] out of those seats because it's a better business model for you, to be honest, but in the

> end where would the province be? There's some sort shelf-life in those strategies, so it's bringing in all of those. Where does the province need to be, what are the skills, where are the resources, what would bringing in international students look like if it was optimally best for an institution, for the government, for the country? So, that's kind of where those things sort of play together. [Participant 6]

For this participant, the "play together" between labour, immigration and education takes place in higher education internationalization efforts. Here, the participant begins talking about internationalization efforts as a "business model" and the problems for long-term internationalization partnerships and programs. This participant's conception of the relationship by stating, "that's kind of where those things sort of play together," demonstrates the process of translation that discursively happens as labour and immigration policies are enrolled into educational policy at the provincial level.

Translation describes what happens when things connect, both human and non-human things, changing one another and forming links (Latour, 1987). That is, there is a change that happens to objects and subjectivities in the way they are enrolled in relations with other things. While internationalization as a business model may economically rely on importing international students, the reality, for this participant, is that the needs of immigration and labour in the province shift student recruitment beyond the "numbers" game to consider needs skilled labour at the provincial, but also at the national and institutional level of the university, as well. So, while the policy discursively establishes the authority for provincial and territorial jurisdictions, it also relegates education beyond the level of the university institution as the labour and immigration needs become central in determining how internationalization unfolds at the university level.

For one participant working in a national organization, the shifts towards focusing on the economic benefits of internationalization are closely connected to more recent reductions in funding to institutions from provincial governments. The relationship between university institutions and provincial governments was mediated through international student differential fees.

> And for many provincial governments, I think it's fair to say, that the revenue generated from the differential tuition fees of international students has been [recently recognized]. I think that there is a risk that they increasingly view that as an alternative source of funding for the institution, and for the institutions, as [provincial governments] cut back on funding universities and colleges. But I think that, having said all that, I think that that is one big shift in terms of the policy context that has led to more economic rationales for internationalization and, you know, certainly universities and colleges need to be responsive and accountable to governments. [Participant 17]

In the COF plan, provincial governments act discursively as a collective to position themselves as central figures on a national scale, as active rather than passive in the national policy scene. The move to a collective transforms the provinces from entities performing only as individuals and creating possibilities that move beyond individual responses. The plan performs internationalization as a duality of provincial and pan-Canadian efforts, in either case, the provincial governments are at the helm of driving partnerships and programs. In doing so, there is a move to re-define the relationship with the federal government and with universities through the discursive activity of this policy.

Law (2009b) showed that textual practices such as taking notes from a speech and preparing notes for talk "generate representations that depict realities." For Law, these are

practices that bring out an ordering effect on the worlds in which those practices are generated. These practices help to "assemble putative realities" (p. 161). In the case of the COF plan, the provincial governments aim to discursively order the relation between the federal government and the provinces and territories in a way that privileges provincial authority in international education. It is one way in which the relationship between the national and provincial actors comes to be performed.

Internationalization as trade: Centering federal relations. There is a strong position in the DFAIT report to emphasize the development of trade relations with other countries through the internationalization work of universities. Here, the federal government has placed internationalization as a key strategy for economic trade development for the national agenda. While strategies such as these are commonly used for building the knowledge economy in many national contexts (Olssen & Peters, 2005), the prevalence of a trade agenda was something that some participants found problematic in that it created tensions with the work of their organizations, which I explain in the next section. The notion of building the knowledge economy at the national level can be seen in nation states on a global scale and, consequently, Canada has a recent history with internationalization of higher education being enrolled in the diplomatic relations of Canada with other countries (Trilokekar, 2009).

Participants talked about differing opinions about the trade agenda in the DFAIT report. For some, the enrolment of federal trade interests into higher education internationalization is problematic for the way it changed the nature of internationalization and, consequently, higher education. One participant suggested that the report focused too much on sensationalizing trade.

> Well, institutions set policies on admission, but you can see one aspect of internationalization, an important part, is the aspect of who you put in because there is a capacity issue. There's no question. We take the great exception to the federal government's recent report [from DFAIT] about capacity and they've indicated there's capacity to double the number of international students in Canada. You know, it's like a rah-rah booster club report for trade. It's not critical. It doesn't look at any way to inform policy with real data. [Participant 6]

For this participant, the focus on trade obscures the "real data" of how many domestic students are enrolled in universities and how the education provision is related to provincial needs for educating a domestic workforce. The notion of a trade-focused strategy hides domestic students as actors in the university and the provincial plans.

Another participant from a national organization saw nuance in the ways that the report dealt with both international and domestic students. This participant suggested that the original focus of the Chakma Panel was to look only at international student recruitment yet their consultations with other people working in the higher education sector led to a broadening of the goals of internationalization, in that domestic students needed to be accounted for in the strategy recommendations. Furthermore, "building partnerships" was deemed as an essential aspect of internationalization. Once again, internationalization has multiple enactments, based on student numbers but also on developing partnerships to enhance a trade agenda. Key here is the way this participant suggested that the work of lobbying and advocacy through educational associations, such as the Canadian Consortium of International Educators, brought about a different perspective. This participant suggested that the Consortium's efforts were influential in how international education is constructed nationally. The Consortium consisted of the

Canadian Bureau of Education (CBIE), the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, Colleges and Institutes Canada, the Canadian Association of Public Schools and Languages Canada. These organizations work through the consortium to advocate directly to the federal government regarding international education issues. The participant from one of the national associations suggested the federal government shifted its focus away from recruitment to focus on a broader agenda of partnerships, something the Consortium supported.

> …the mandate of that group started off very narrowly focused on international student recruitment. But the very report that came out at the end of the day painted a much broader picture of the importance of international education and that it not only be focused on recruitment but also about sending Canadian students abroad and also about building partnerships. So, I think that there is recognition, a growing recognition that we have to be cautious as a country and as institutions that we remain balanced. [Participant 17]

For some participants, there was interplay between internationalization as capacity – meaning international student numbers at Canadian institutions – and internationalization as mechanism aimed at building trade relations. One of the participants from the provincial government felt that the focus on trade narrowed the focus of the federal plan, suggesting that the provincial plan was much more of a broadly integrated approach to internationalization.

> So, certainly the Council of Federations helped because the Federal Advisory Panel that was tasked last year to go out and look at in a sense, the same thing the provinces have done, but from a federal lens. And their lens is also more focused on trade. Our lens is focused a little more comprehensively around education that will have these other lenses we recognized, from immigration to trade. The federal and Department of

> Foreign Affairs and International Trade has a clear mandate for trade and has seen and would like to see education even as a stronger pillar as part of the trade agenda and we think that's great. We also think it needs, however, to be integrated within the broader perspective of the many lenses that are on international education to be successful. So, that's kind of the broad players. [Participant 6]

There were tensions in how the COF plan and the DFAIT report played out for participants at the national level. One participant was clear in the articulation of this problem: the differences between the two plans are so significant that the ways in which they can both be operationalized into the Canadian higher education scene is problematic. This participant gave a visual description of how incompatible these plans are.

> In looking at the federal plan, on the one hand, I can look at it and, you know, if I kind of squint or blur my vision… you know those 3D posters?....If I kind of make my eyes go a little crossed like that, I look at it and I say, you know what? It's not that different from …the COF plan….But then when I go line by line, I look at it and I say the two visions are incompatible. [Participant 13]

While this participant suggested there might be superficial connections between the federal and provincial strategies, part of the incompatibility stemmed from the timing of the documents. The timing of the federal document was something that this participant and others noted as being significant in the national policy landscape. This participant at the national level was critical of the ways in which the federal report was staged. For this participant, there was a lack of communication and connection between the two policy statements. While there was some consultation between the COF and DFAIT, this participant expressed that the connection between the statements was weak.

> So, then in the summer of 2011, COF released that plan, the Council of Federation released that plan and it was shortly after that that DFAIT announced the employment of its panel. So, the timing was always a little bit off to begin with, right? Wouldn't it have been great if [they] had all been doing [their] work at the same time but nevertheless.… CMEC formally had a couple of interactions with the panel, you know, there was a small meeting with the Chair of the panel that the Director General took early on to kind of get some more information about what process they were planning to employ, what their scope was, that kind of thing. A number of members of the Panel actually … met with the Advisory Committee of Deputy Ministers in January 2012. [Participant 13]

While the connections were made through meetings and consultation opportunities, this participant suggested that the limited form of interaction was not enough to make the two documents reconcilable. Indeed, for this participant, they effectively became separate entities. This participant elaborated tensions between the processes for the COF and DFAIT documents.

> …what the federal government should have done was not appoint a panel but picked up the COF Plan and say 'we agree now let's figure out how to do it'. You know, in a very, in very specific ways the [DFAIT] panel certainly told provinces and territories that they had read the plan and that they were taking it into account. [It was heard] from DFAIT officials as well, that, you know, that they read the [COF] plan and they thought it was useful. But you know, what hasn't happened, and I think this is somewhat telling, is no one has ever come back… and said 'hey, we read this plan that says strong collaboration is the key to doing this. Let's talk about what that looks like.' No one has ever written a letter of response saying 'we read [the COF] plan and here's our view.' And it does sort of put a little bit of, it puts that, what I think is always in kind of already in always a delicate relationship, it makes it even a little bit more delicate.

> Because now the federal government has received this advice from this panel. Again, what's funny, is again they're not turning around and saying 'let's talk about how to work together on this.' They have said 'tell us what you think about these specific proposals in this plan' but that has not struck the note that perhaps they were hoping for but it hasn't struck the note that leads to kind of a broad conversation about how to do this together. [Participant 13]

Furthermore, this participant contended that enrolling immigration into the DFAIT plan has changed the relationships between pan-Canadian interests and federal government agencies. Proposed changes to federal immigration rules, and consequently student visas, meant a need for stronger connections between CMEC and CIC. The participant elaborated on the tightening of the relationship:

> [The relationship between CMEC and CIC] has developed more recently, or at least [it has become] more intense more recently as CIC has proposed changes to be made to the international student visa processing process for lack of a better word. And so that, I mean, that's a more tightly focused project but it has led…both CMEC and all of the provinces together, as well as all of the provinces on a bilateral basis, to have a bit more of a, to have a bit of a tighter relationship with CIC and to talk with them about a few other issues that are of common interest. And [CMEC] often does that with both CIC and DFAIT but certainly the contact with CIC has been increasing, I think it's fair to say, over the last couple of years as a result of CIC kind of wanting to make these changes. That's just, I think it's just led [to talking] to them more often in general. [Participant 13]

As this quote reflects, this participant communicated strong sentiments about how the federal strategy tightens the relationships between national organizations, provincial governments and federal agencies, with the federal government at the helm.

Controversies in the Multiple Performances of Internationalization for Universities

The multiplicity of internationalization as it emerged through the federal and the provincial plans created tensions for the university participants in the study. The tensions between the practices and their realities (Law, 2009a) came to the fore in talking with participants at the university about the notion of a national plan or strategy for internationalization. The existence of a unified policy in the internationalization of Canadian higher education was a contested issue among participants. In response to questions about what policies existed at the national level in Canada, one participant at the university remarked,

> Well, implicit in your question seems to be an assertion that we currently have policy. I don't think we do [have a policy on internationalization in Canada]. I think we are all over the map. When on one day, the [foreign affairs] minister talks about the importance of international students and then two weeks later they shut the Iranian embassy, leaving 150 students orphaned and they didn't even think about it. There is no harmonization. There is no policy. [Participant 3]

This comment referred to a decision made by DFAIT to close the Canadian Embassy in Iran, which followed Iran's decision to remove its ambassador from Canada. This decision meant that many Iranian students' visa applications to study in Canada were effectively left hanging without resolution and that Iranian students currently living in Canadian cities were left without diplomatic connections to their own country.

However, while this participant described the absence of policy, this participant later noted the national policy context for internationalization as being "multiple" and fragmented, noting the existence of many different processes of internationalization in the Canadian higher education arena.

> We are of multiple minds. And it's not harmonized and one-half generally doesn't know what the other half is doing. Do I expect one day to see Canada have an international policy, I hope we can come to the point where we would, but at this point, given all the stuff going on, my view is that [this province] would get left behind. [Participant 3]

This participant's responses reflected tensions between the ways in which internationalization is being framed by university institutions and by federal actors, and the ways in which provinces are enrolled into the realities created by policies. Of interest here is the way this participant at the university suggested that even a unified national policy, expressed here as a harmonized policy, might work to exclude particular provincial interests, as these might not be accounted for in the national agenda. This participant offered that the way such a policy is harmonized might in fact operate in a way that is exclusive.

Other participants at the university expressed concern about the inconsistencies between policy intent and realities. One participant from central administration at the university commented, "Policy intents are not being achieved because [federal government and universities] have different interpretations of what our roles are as [university actors] in the field in the first place. So, yeah I think that is challenging" [Participant 16]. Again, referring to the same scenario of diplomatic relations with Iran, a federal decision that directly influenced the working of the university, this participant expressed frustration with how decisions at the federal level make uneasy working relationships at the university level. This participant continued to describe the tensions created for the university in its relations with students and with other national players in education.

> We have faculties that are just screaming down our neck right now because we are not doing anything to get their Iranian students here. Well, we have written to the Minister, we coordinated AUCC to write to the Minister, we coordinated [with other universities in the province] to write to the Minister. We're in conversation with the post in Ankara who is just overwhelmed and guess what? We severed diplomatic relations, what do you think? And also the Iranian Government, do you think the Iranian Government is keen to see all their top talent leaving Iran never to come back? Do you think they might be putting some roadblocks into the document that students need to satisfy the security requirements of the Canadian Government? Maybe. So, I don't know that for sure, but if I was them, I would. [Participant 16]

Here, the participant indicated how immigration rules and foreign policy changes impact the work that happens in the university. The relationship between the Canadian government and the university is mediated through such policy instances. As the participant described it here, the university is left in the wake of federal policy decision, particularly around issues of immigration, student visas and international student enrolment. The process of student acceptances to programs is made more complex as this participant described it, as issues of immigration entered into decision-making at the university level.

Policy disconnect. Indeed, the notion of a Canadian policy for internationalization at the national level was troublesome also for the ways in which the federal government's priorities came to bear on the practices of those at the university. Participants at the university level spoke at length about the influences of the Chakma Report and policies arising out of immigration issues from the federal government as illustrating a "policy disconnect" [Participant 16]. This participant talked about how the

work of CIC comes to be performed in ways that limit rather than facilitate increases in international students at the university. For this participant, a key tension is how CIC "laid out that they view international students as potential immigrants, [yet] we still have [embassy] posts that deny students their study permit" [Participant 16]. The tensions over who decides which students have access is felt directly at the level of the university, both administrators and faculty.

Another senior administrator at the university suggested that there were significant tensions for universities in dealing with internationalization given immigration strategies are enrolled in the DFAIT policy. This participant suggested damaging aspects of this association. This participant commented that he "made a pitch to Chakma…and the final document [from DFAIT], you should read it. It's not encouraging" [Participant 3]. This participant also elaborated on the tensions for universities in the way internationalization is enrolled with immigration.

> The Chakma Report is at best unhelpful and probably hurtful, because it talks about university student mobility as part of an immigration policy, which is fatal to universities, like us. If our partners see us as part of a government effort to steal their bright young people, they're going to shut us down. [Participant 3]

One participant from the university was clear that the enrolment of immigration in the way that internationalization has come to be performed through policies was a "uniting" factor between the university and government.

> …the set of policies, it's not so much policies, but it's immigration regulation, that's probably the piece that most guides us, I would say unites us across government lines. And that's part of the process we're in here right now with changes to immigration regulations. That proposal I first went to Ottawa in November of 2010 where immigration called

> stakeholders to say, "We're going to change the International Student Program and we want to enhance the integrity of the program. [Participant 16]

In the preceding quote, the term unites is used to denote connection, but the ways in which this participant talked about the relations between the federal immigration strategies and the university were not well aligned. The participant described the way that universities were called to provide consultation on how to revise international student visa provisions. However, the suggestion that there might be unity in addressing regulation changes was problematic for this participant, in that there were tensions in how stakeholders are able to enact internationalization policy. For example, this participant later showed that while reforms to visa rules related to immigration regulation, such as those set out in the DFAIT plan, suggest the necessity to work together with universities, in actuality, the performance of internationalization policy as it is enrolled with immigration policies make this difficult for universities. At the time of the interview, these changes were not enacted, but were floating among the discourse of the increased role of immigration in changing university practice with international students. In talking about these changes, the participant enrolled different terminology to describe the effects the changes would have on the university practice, suggesting they were legislation, reporting requirements, and operations. In any case, the implications of enrolling immigration and visa checks into the work of universities affected the university's capacity to be effective, in terms of financial implications and in terms of responding to students' applications.

> ….[CIC] is saying we're going to change legislation and maybe legislation is the wrong word. [CIC says,] 'We're going to change the regulations and, provinces, we need you to take on some roles. We need you to take

> on the role of designating what the institutions are in your provinces that can admit and educate international students. So, vaguely we might be saying as well to [higher education] institutions that there's going to be some reporting requirement".... So, of course, institutions are most concerned about that piece: what are we going to be asked to do in terms of reporting and what is that going to mean to our business processes? And what is that going to mean to our bottom line? Because if we had to add business processes, we probably are increasing our costs in doing so or we're increasing our time to respond to an application for admission and already we feel we're too slow in responding to those. [Participant 16]

This participant talked about recent changes that might emerge through DFAIT for universities to begin tracking how many student permits are issued, how many students are enrolled and how many students complete the programs. For this participant, this level of reporting would be problematic for HEIs, as this constitutes their work as compliance managers rather than educators.

> That's the piece, that as institutions, I think we're fearful of. What exactly is it that CIC is thinking about in terms of what the institutions obligation for reporting is going to be and at what point are we going to be consulted and is that consultation really a consultation? Or is it just an announcement: here's what the requirement will be. [Participant 16]

Later, this participant elaborated on the federal government introducing the notion of reporting mechanisms for international student permits and enrolments. For this participant, such changes did serve to disconnect, rather than bring together, the university and the federal government.

> This policy, this realm of policy does not bring stakeholders together. It does not facilitate us all being on the same table trying to achieve the same goal. CIC has no interest in a partnership with Canadian institutions, is what I believe. There is no dialogue. They say, "Oh it's too early to have

> a dialogue because we don't know what the process is going to be." Well, the dialogue should have started by saying, "What is the problem that you're trying to address?" And they would say, "We don't know what the problem is because we have no checks and balances on the people who we issue study permits to." So, we can't even really say whether we have a problem or not. Well, could we? Is there some other way of trying to determine that than changing the whole regulations and putting this whole reporting piece on? And what is the reporting piece? [Participant 16]

For this participant, the ways in which the university will be enrolled into the federal priorities for tracking international student enrollments, particularly related to visa control, creates potential for HEIs to become institutions of policing policy rather than about determining educationally appropriate programming.

This participant reflected further on the policy disconnect for universities in dealing with both federal and provincial strategies. While both universities and DFAIT identify the importance of attracting the best students, the ways that immigration is enrolled into the international student process makes it problematic to enact a plan to attract the best students at the university institutional level. Both the federal government and the university want to "attract top talent", but the ways in which a focus on immigration and visa rules ties the institutions together are not compatible. For this participant, this is another source of policy disconnect.

> Because that's another challenge and that's the other policy disconnect. While Immigration has very clearly laid out that they view international students as potential immigrants, we still have visa posts who deny students their study permit because they don't think they'll return to their home country. And it is a total policy disconnect. It just makes no sense at all any longer because there is nothing any young person in the world can do to prove that they would return to their home country. That's not

> how the world is structured any longer. That, in our world, is maddening. It drives us bonkers when that is the reason why a student is denied their Study Permit and we've given them thirty thousand dollars in graduate funding and we've assessed them to be a top student and given them top funding and we have a place for them in our research lab. And then someone says, "Well, we don't think you're really bonafide, we think you're really going to Canada to become a permanent resident." [Participant 16]

This participant described the incompatibilities for universities in dealing with immigration issues and student enrolment. When universities become policing institutions, they are excluded from decision-making and power. This participant described "this vacuum from the institutions' perspective as to what the heck is going on in [the] conversation [related to international student visa reporting] because it's just been between the provinces and territories and the Federal Government." The relationship between the province and the federal government was deemed strong for this participant, and that tight connection operated at the exclusion of universities. In the interview, this participant suggested that while the provincial government was meant to be a middle connector in terms of communicating messages from the federal government to the university, this often was done in a way that marginalized the universities: "[The provincial government] was like pushing a cone of silence, "I have this really important information to share with you" and [I question], what was so important about that? There's no content behind what you just said to us." Even when changes to immigration regulations might get announced, this participant expressed that "it's not going to clarify for the institutions what operationally is going to be different for us." The cone of silence created uncertainty in the role of universities.

Policy divide. The university is marginalized by uncertainty about its role in internationalization. This participant talked about the difficulty for the university administrators who deal with policies at the university level to lead when decision-making power for visas and entrance to the country is determined in embassy posts that are far away removed from the university itself, a position summed up as, "So CIC says, 'Okay, we're in control of immigration.' Provinces say, 'We're in control of education," but where that left universities was unknown. Later, this participant was clear that the divide between the federal government ministry and the university institution was reinforced as universities were excluded from defining the problem of what might be happening with immigration regulations for international students:

> CIC has no interest in a partnership with Canadian institutions is what I believe. There is no dialogue. They say, 'It's too early to have a dialogue because we don't know what the process is going to be." Well, the dialogue should have started by saying what is the problem that you're trying to address. [Participant 16]

Participants at national and provincial levels expressed a view that the policies between the federal and provincial levels were connected, though there were diverging ideas about how that plays out for university actors. A participant from a national organization stated that the responsibility for dealing with tensions between the COF and the DFAIT report was something that was best sorted bi-laterally between governments and through the work of national organizations such as CMEC and COF. In doing so, this participant suggested that the universities themselves were not implicated in these tensions. "I think CMEC, the provinces and territories and the federal government have to figure that part out. But I don't think it causes any undue harm for the institutions themselves. I just think it's a challenge that has to be met here [at the national level]"

[Participant 13]. For this participant, it was key that the provinces and federal governments stay engaged in internationalization. Yet, this was not always easy to do, particularly after the announcement of the federal panel, "when all of a sudden there was more uncertainty about where the feds were at."

Others at the university argued there were challenges in the ways that faculty members felt pressure for the university to serve the market interests of the provincial government.

> So, I guess what I worry about is when we do our internationalization are we just doing it about expanding our markets, putting [this province] in a competitive position in a global system, making Canada a known country for its peacemaking, but not actually playing a role in materially changing the way we interact with other countries so that we can all get better off? [Participant 2]

Here, this participant, a professor who was known in the university for international work, being appointed as an advisory to senior administration on internationalization, raised awareness of tensions existing in enacting policies. The policies focused only on technical skills of "expanding the market", on economic material gain for the province, rather than focused on goals to "improve society, to reach to others, to provide a great learning environment." This was a principled position, and those that made policy in the university ought to be asking, "What are the principles behind [what we do]? You know, why do you think that makes the world better?" From this professor's perspective, in the connection between the university and provincial plans for economic rationality, the university becomes an economic actor driven only by the needs of the province, and this was troubling. This participant suggest the university becomes divided and then shared what the university stood to lose, "I guess that's, I worry if internationalization becomes

about competition mostly then we've lost it. We're screwing up big time because that's capitalism, it's a huge part of what we're told in [university]: to be competitive" [Participant 2].

The economic model required to sustain the economic gains was problematic for other participants, as well. Another professor reflected on efforts to engage in internationalization work and how the many ways in which internationalization is discussed is a powerful effect of the entrepreneurial mindset. The focus on trade and aid agendas, from this participant's perspective, masked the other work that is done through internationalization, work to commodify education as a service for the market.

> So, internationalization with this new entrepreneurial model became, in effect, [about whether or not] you were a supporter. It wasn't just… meeting other people. Some people might go into it thinking, that's what it is, but really it's about setting up more than trade, more than aid, but actually capturing markets for commodification of educational services. So, when I hear for example, [this university is] interested in internationalization, to me that's the fundamental purpose of internationalization: how do we make money off foreign students, how do we find and sell our services abroad, how do we make sure our contacts open up markets for us and how do we expropriate other people's knowings and attach some value to it that we can gain a profit from? So, to me that's the dominant concept. But it can be talked about in a multiplicity of other ways and that's what gives it its power. It sounds like a really positive thing so the normative aspects become more important. [Participant 8]

For this participant, it was the multiple ways in which internationalization is practiced that make it both elusive and powerful.

Analysis: Internationalization as An Object Multiple

The multiple framings of internationalization as they are presented in the texts and as they are brought about by the university raise questions about how these multiple articulations of internationalization are able to co-exist. Certainly, there was no agreement or singularity on how internationalization is assembled among the participants in the study. If they were "incompatible" as plans and strategies, as suggested my one participant in the study, then the ways they are enacted were negated, obliterated, by participants at the university who saw them as non-existent ("there is no national strategy") but also in a later breath as "multiple". How can we understand the ways these policies, as *objects multiple* (Mol, 2010b), co-exist?

Policy multiplicity and co-existence. Mol (2010b) wrote about the emergence of technologies to show the complexities of co-existence, as multiple versions of things exist at the same time. In aiming to show the co-existence of different forms of cars, she showcases how the emergence and stability of the electric car is not just a matter of good technical design. Its ability to permeate society, to be picked up and enrolled into practices, is not ensured solely by having a successful design. Certainly design is important, but so, too, is the way the electric car is able to attract interest from other actors. The ability of the electric car to sustain itself requires the interest of funders, investors, builders, in the enrollment of other actors: charging stations, road rules and regulations, and expectations about what a car is and can do. All of these associations must come together in order for the car to "exist". It's not simply a matter of design; it's a matter of hard work in the assembling of the network from which the electric car emerges. The process must start somewhere: "actors associate with other actors, thus

forming a network in which they are all made into "actors" as the associations allow each of them to act. Actors are enacted, enabled, and adapted by their associates while in their turn enacting, enabling and adapting these" (p. 260). She contended that the relations that make actors are *fluid associations*, and actors participate in different networks through discourses, logics, modes of ordering and practices. Indeed, "things get complex" (p. 260).

The notion of fluid associations relates to Mol's (1999) contention of ontological politics in what comes to be assembled. Showcasing such politics, Mol pointed out that the electric car emerges in a context that is already designed for other modes of transportation that do not necessarily happily co-exist. Bicycles, trains, cars, all of these modes require other actors to make them happen and these requirements may very well not "associate" in harmony. Bicycle lanes take up space in which cars used to drive; trains depend on means for people to get to the station itself and if these modes become too attractive, they may replace trains altogether. Here, Mol argued, is where we see co-existence may not be smooth.

In a similar way in higher education, the emergence of massive open online courses (MOOCs) have been challenged to successfully become a part of the learning landscape. While much critique exists about their success, O'Connor (2014) argued the discourse around these courses is often focused on the disruption these courses offer to traditional learning, so that they become threatening to the institution. In her research with policymakers at universities in Australia, she discovered that senior administrators who have wanted to see the success of MOOCs, and are responding to public pressure to do so, have sought to use them not specifically as pedagogical tools but rather as tools to

achieve other institutional goals. She states, "from an institutional perspective, MOOCs are being transformed from moments of disruption to opportunities for co-option….MOOCs are not simply an outward force instigating changes to the university system, but are being developed through a complex interrelation of different interests and drivers" (p. 634). In other words, senior administrators have looked for ways to link MOOCs directly within the institution, not as external mechanisms that exist outside the university. The extent to which MOOC as learning platform and MOOC as institutional lever can co-exist requires further research, she suggests. O'Connor neglects to consider the politics in shifts between the realities of learning and those of strategizing in how MOOCs are institutional actors. Indeed, co-existence may not be smooth and may be rife with tensions but examining these tensions brings the work of associations to the fore. Analyses require terms that help to illuminate these tensions: "collaboration, clash, addition, tension, exclusion, inclusion, and so on. Terms variously adapted to various cases. Terms that help us to attune to different events and situations" (Mol, 2010b, p. 259).

The notion of multiplicity becomes a useful frame for looking at how the two policies, even though "incompatible" as described by one participant, produce internationalization as *an object multiple* (Mol, 2010b). The focus in studying co-existence is to look at "different ways of handling problems, framing concerns, enacting reality…explor[ing] the merits and drawbacks of different modes of ordering and, along with that, of different kinds of coordination" (p. 264).

In looking at the ways internationalization was framed in the policy texts, it is discursively produced as an object multiple. In the COF plan, the provincial

governments aim to act as a collective, constructed as central figures on a national scale. Internationalization is realized through the duality of provincial and pan-Canadian steering efforts in the move to re-define the relationship with the federal government and with universities through the discursive activity of this policy. In the Chakma Report, internationalization emerges through practices of trade relations managed through the federal government. The report brought together interests of immigration, trade and international mobility in federal priorities, situating the Prime Minister as the champion of international education.

Dale and Robertson (2007a) asserted that the governance of education as a national realm is currently distributed across a range of scales, not only at the level of the government responsible for legislatively governance. The jurisdictional struggles over educational governance in Canada have been long-standing, and as Jones (2009) pointed out, the federal government's involvement in higher education, in particular, has been sustained through a collection of interventions, such as federal transfer payments, cultural and language policies, and student financial assistance. However, the university actors in this research study talked about their own uncertainties in dealing with competing discourses to frame internationalization as a provincial or federal jurisdiction. As the university in this research was enrolled into these competing frames, tensions were created for university actors themselves. That is, by engaging in internationalization plans and strategies, university actors talked about the ordering effects of engaging with internationalization policy that work to construct the university institution itself. So, how is the university performed through its enrolment in these struggles over jurisdictional governance?

Assembling the university. Ozga (2005) contested the notion of policy transfer as travelling policies that remain fixed and unchanged in local contexts. Rather, she suggested viewing policies as embedded, as they "come up against existing priorities and practices" (p. 209) and are translated in local contexts. For Ozga, it is the policy that changes as it is enrolled into local practices. However, ANT's relational ontology suggests that there is a more significant process of change at play. Translation, suggested Latour (1987), describes what happens when things connect, changing one another and forming links. The analysis in ANT asks what things become as they are hooked up and connected (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010), through such fluid associations as Mol (2010b) discussed. Consequently, the notion that internationalization plans or strategies can be simply transported from federal or provincial jurisdictions to universities is problematic when we consider the ways that policies are translated into practice at the university.

In negotiating between the federal and provincial plans for internationalization, the political reorganization of the relationship between provincial and federal government actors was brought to the fore through internationalization policies. The university becomes the site of "making sense" of much of these tensions. Internationalization as an *object multiple* means a muddling of the way in which the university enacts relations with other actors. One senior administration participant described both multiple and non-existent national policies for internationalization. While doing so, this participant described that the activities of the university in internationalization are to some extent emerging in the changing policy context in which higher education internationalization policy plays out nationally.

In some cases, the university participants talked about their roles as international agents, as they became closely associated with immigration and citizenship policies emerging from the federal government. In describing this association, one participant characterized the relation that developed between the university and the federal government through immigration regulation. However, this participant suggested that this association was divisive, as it "didn't bring stakeholders together". From an ANT perspective, internationalization policies as experienced through immigration regulations did indeed bring the actors together. Even though CIC "had no interest in partnering with Canadian institutions", it did not mean that the university institution was cast aside or removed from relations with the federal government. Rather, this institution itself became a site for realizing the centrality of the federal government as powerful actor in the higher education realm through the work of the university.

In another instance, a participant from the university suggested that there was a policy disconnect as "visa posts" denied students' study permits, even though these students were accepted with full funding to the university. Again, immigration regulations become a site in which the multiple internationalization policies are realized at the university – students gain entrance and are denied entrance to the university not only through their acceptance to programs, but as study permits are regulated "externally", the Embassy sites are connected directly to the work of the university officers responsible for facilitating student access and acceptance. Again, things such as visas and permits for study at the university associated the federal government through its Embassy offices directly to the university, though not through means that made the internationalization efforts of the university easy to achieve.

The triad of association between the provincial government, the federal government and the university was suggested by one participant in describing "the vacuum" of information that was felt by post-secondary institutions in the provincial government meetings. While this participant suggested that the relationship was "just between the provinces and territories and federal government", the suggestion by this participant of the uncertainty for the role of the universities in this relation kept a fluid association in which the post-secondary institutions were not disconnected, but rather uncertain. Even though its responsibilities in future regulations might be unknown, the university was certainly associated with interplay between who would hold power to control internationalization. The university became a site for the struggle over educational jurisdiction, as objects such as visas, immigration regulations, citizenship issues are enrolled into internationalization at the university.

Some professors in the study raised the nature of the university as an institution embedded in trade relations through engagements in internationalization practices. While the role of the university working for the public good has come into question under the influences of neoliberal governmentality in higher education (Olssen & Peters, 2005), the questions that one professor raised about the relation to the "expanding the market" for provincial economic gain illustrated unease for this professor in the internationalization work of the university. The struggles to define the role of the university in connecting with other research partners and international students is influenced by the provincial priorities for international engagement.

Of interest here was the prevalence of associations built in relation to immigration issues for those in central senior administration positions at the university. Even though

both the federal and provincial documents focused on trade, the university actors interviewed here described their connections to other actors as deeply entrenched through controversies related to immigration issues. This is not to suggest that trade was absent, as it could be argued that the countries with which immigration regulations will engage universities with countries with which both the Canadian and provincial governments engage with priority in trade relations and certainly trade relations became important in other networks described in this thesis (see earlier network related to the MOU). Research that further interrogates the means by which actors are connected through trade relations is needed and should follow this association.

In suggesting that national internationalization policies are both non-existent and multiple, one participant described the fluidity of these policies as they are enacted in the university context. Another participant, a professor interested in the discourse around internationalization at the university, suggested there was a power in the multiple ways in which internationalization happened at the university: the focus on the entrepreneurial activities that "expropriate other people's knowings and attach some value to it" for economic profit was masked by discourses of engaging with international partnerships for cultural reasons, such as "meeting other people". The multiplicity created a fluid association that was reflected in the uncertainty expressed by participants. However, such fluidity is performative, too, as the controversies over how internationalization is framed changes what the actors become in their engagements with policy.

Power in multiplicity. Gaventa's (2006) notion of power is helpful to understand the controversies in internationalization as an *object multiple*. Gaventa argued that while much of the literature focuses on the degree of conflict visible between actors, there are

ways in which power operates by other means, suggesting three forms of power. There is *visible* power that is observable and occurs through decision-making as open contestations of pluralist interests. Also, *hidden* power occurs as particular interests and actors are privileged in setting the political agenda, though these institutions and people influence spaces that are not open in public spaces. The notion of hidden suggests that the privileging of certain actors and institutions is not public, but it is known and arranged by those in central positions. However, the periphery spaces do not have access to how the political agenda is set. Finally, *invisible* power is the most insidious, argued Gaventa, as it shapes the "ideological boundaries of participation" (p. 29). At the heart of invisible power is the act of shaping meaning and what is acceptable, conflict is often not visible and there is an internalization of powerlessness from other actors.

Gaventa's (2006) conceptualization of invisible power aligns with a socio-material understanding of power. For Latour, the exercise of power is an effect, a *consequence* of collective action in defining and redefining "what 'holds' everyone together" (p. 273). It is in the act of defining and redefining that actors accumulate power from those who are doing the action. Power is generated through the collective action of assembling; this is the power of translation, "a process in which different actors come together, influence and change one another, and create linkages that eventually form a network of action and material" (Koyama, 2011, p. 24). This is the study of *associations*, how actors and organizations hold together the relations in which they are composed and the ways in which power is generated by doing so. Powerful actors are those performed through the work of the collective action. While Gaventa suggests that invisible power shapes the ideological boundaries of what can exist, Latour's notion of power suggests

that that is by actors coming together, in the forming of associations, that such power is generated. The collective action of defining what holds people together is not necessarily visible and, as Latour suggests, it is this blackboxing that needs exploring. As Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) stated, this exploration is focused on how "the power structure that generates a network becomes hidden or masked" (p. 243).

The struggles to define internationalization are shaped in ways that are determined outside the boundaries of any one jurisdiction alone. As Ball, Maguire & Braun (2011) reminded us, policies rarely operate in isolation and understanding their translation into practice requires considering the other factors at play in contexts. The participants from the university articulated uncertainty, a fluidity in the nature of internationalization as it was performed at their institution through their work. While articulating tenuous relations with both federal and provincial institutions, there were connections between the actors. These connections defined and redefined the object multiple of internationalization, generating invisible power to define internationalization. Indeed, the work of the university was connected to the provincial and federal governments as institutions through its relations in immigration, in student enrolments, in dealing with Embassy officials. While the university actors described a "disconnection" between the work they sought to do and the control from provincial and federal priorities, the work of defining what internationalization was about operated as an invisible power, one that defined the very nature of internationalization itself. Internationalization played out in several different instances: as a re-working of the provincial-federal relationship, as a means for student recruitment, as a means of increasing funding to universities, as a site for the vying of national interest groups. Yet the object multiple of

internationalization meant the site of power generation was constantly reworked through the act of defining what internationalization was. The articulation by university actors that their work would be marginalized as secondary to provincial economic goals, that decision-making about immigration regulations occurred without the input or knowledge of university institutions, that federal strategies for internationalization would "leave behind" provincial actors illustrated not that the university actors were disconnected, but rather that the power generated through their seemingly unattached existence was invisible. As invisible power, the space in which the articulation, or as Gaventa suggests, the shaping of what internationalization means, becomes difficult to know even though actors are engaged in creating such spaces through their own work.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I showed how two policies, the Council of the Federation's marketization plan for international education and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade's advisory panel report for international education have become enrolled into networks with actors at the level of university, provincial government, national associations and federal government departments. While these two policies shared a similar timeframe of release, the realities of internationalization that emerged both through discursive and material means were strikingly different, and particularly in how control for internationalization was negotiated in the policies, suggesting a controversy in how internationalization comes to be realized as these policies become associated into networks of actors. I also showed how universities themselves struggle to reconcile the multiple reality of internationalization through these networks. In the analysis, I suggested that internationalization is an object multiple, meaning its reality is

performed in multiple ways as the institutional relations between actors are challenged in the every day life of doing internationalization work at the university.

Chapter Seven: Spaces of Internationalization and the Performance of Power

Towards my goal of mapping policy networks through interactions with policies, in this chapter, I discuss how the notion of assemblage is helpful in understanding power relations in policy networks related to internationalization of higher education. Specifically, I focus on two contributions assemblage thinking brings to policy analysis in internationalization of higher education. First, I argue that the action of internationalization is not held by any one actor alone and, consequently, assemblage thinking helps us to see not only the multiplicity of actors but the ways in which their interactions are performative in higher education internationalization. Second, and as a consequence of this multiplicity, is the way in which power is performed through the collective action of these actors in ways that designate what becomes important and legitimate in internationalization through interactions with policy.

I begin by revisiting the notion of assemblage to argue its analytical utility lies in its ability to show how various things, both human and non-human actors, are involved in policy processes. By this, I mean to suggest assemblage thinking brings the heterogeneity of things to the fore. In particular, I consider how exploring the assemblages that emerge in policy network analysis provide a means to consider the connections between actors, what connects them, and how such connections help us to understand the policy spaces created through networks. I agree with Roberson et al. (2012) that any project that involves mapping relates to the spatiality of power, meaning the inequities with which political power is exercised, how it gathers around the center, and what is included and excluded as legitimate in how policy networks assemble. Drawing on Gaventa's conceptualization of the spaces of policy, I show how the notion of assemblage helps to

understand not only the visible spaces in which all actors can participate, but the spaces in which power operates to be both hidden, as decisions are made at a distance, and and invisible, so that the underlying logic by which we practice internationalization is not necessarily readily known in the ways that the multiplicity of actors works to blackbox (Latour, 2005), that is, to mask, the work of all actors as though only a few are powerful at all.

Assemblage Thinking in Internationalization Policy Analysis

The notion of assemblage focuses on the interaction between humans and non-humans, not individuals as independent, static entities themselves. Consequently, assemblage thinking moves the material world of policies from passive agencies into mediators, things that circulate between spaces, connecting with purpose to "transform, distort and modify the meaning in the elements" (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, p. 11). In this way, policies as mediators are agential, and the focus of research is to consider how these objects affect practice. Consequently, there is an ontological question in ANT. Actors come to be defined through their actions (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010). This raises questions about what a policy actor is and what they do. Actor-network theory is based on an ontology of relations, a material-semiotic approach that treats "everything in the social and natural worlds as a continuously generated effect of the webs of relations within which they are located. It assumes that nothing has reality or form outside the enactment of those relations" (Law, 2009, p. 141). And as things become, there are ordering practices at play through those relations.

Gorur (2011) reminded us that, "assemblage theory focuses on the historical processes through which apparent universalisations appear to be achieved" (p. 618). By

this, she tells us that the notion of assemblage requires we understand phenomena not as the single entity by which they often present themselves. Assemblage thinking requires we aim to know the many things that bring about a final entity – this is the blackboxing that Latour (2005) tells us about. The notion of assemblage "focuses analytic attention on how disparate material and discursive practices come together to form dynamic associations" (Koyama & Varenne, 2012). Things that are seemingly distant and unconnected are shown to form linkages and connections. As Mol (2010b) states, "against the implied fantasy of a masterful, separate actor, what is highlighted is the activity of all the associated actors involved. A strategist may be inventive, but no body acts alone" (p. 256).

When we look at the networks of actors that form around the work of policy, assemblage thinking requires that we look for "what links [them] together" (Latour, 1986, p. 273). Reality is performed "through everyone's efforts to define it" (p. 273). The analytical strength of assemblage thinking is not only in the description of what is linked, but an analysis of the collective action generated through those associations. Indeed, in determining what is powerful, the focus should be on "those who practically define or redefine what 'holds' everyone together" (p. 273). Latour describes this as the shift from an ostensible definition of power to a performative definition. In other words, he suggests, "this shift *from principle to practice* allows us to treat the vague notion of power not as a cause of people's behavior but as the *consequence* (my emphasis) of an intensive activity of enrolling, convincing and enlisting" (p. 273). It is this focus on the performative that brings to the fore the practical resources, meaning the material aspects

of the social, that are involved in the everyday performance of what is powerful. These "things" are inherent to the study of power.

Also, it helps us to consider other actors than policymakers alone. Gorur (2014) suggested policy actors are diverse, widespread and difficult to identify. In her study of the ways in which knowledge is created through the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), she asked, "was a PISA scientist not also doing policy work as assiduously as a minister of education?" (p. 613). Indeed, the doing of policy involves many actors and assemblage thinking takes us beyond the most immediate level of those who script policies on paper to search for those who script it through practice. For example, policy takes place across many levels, as seen in this study in the networks that formed around MOUs as faculty, administrators, research offices, foreign affairs departments, embassies and provincial governments acted collectively to bring about a research project. The embassy isn't visible in the immediacy of the research project when viewed as a disconnected entity, nor in the institution of the university. But its presence is known through the signing of the MOU, through the ambassador and the presence of the honorary consul who serves on the university Senate, through the granting and denying of student visas, through the enrolment of the trade commissioners into the internationalization strategy of the federal government. In this way, as one participant elaborated the university itself is engaged in a process of international relations. Indeed, the work of internationalization when studied through the notion of assemblage shows that there is a political project at play in the "enrolling, convincing and enlisting" to which Latour highlighted.

Furthermore, assemblage thinking rejects the notion of the lone powerful central actor (Mol, 2010b). In the data, I discussed the way in which the prime minister is cast as the champion of international education. If that "fact" were to be accepted as representative of reality, then the means by which the prime minister himself enacts internationalization could be easily traced. But as Latour (2005) suggested, words alone are not enough to create the powerful central figure. Rather, assemblage thinking helped to see how it is not the prime minister alone who does this work – university actors' relations with the federal actors born through connections with visas, trade agreements, scholarships, and embassies play an important role in centralizing the federal government's role. In order for internationalization to reach the scales to which the DFAIT reports suggests, it could never remain fixed in the site of the Prime Minister's Office (PMO). There it would lie disconnected. If actors are not enacted through the actions of others, "they are no longer able to do all that much themselves. They stop 'working'" (Mol, 2010b, p. 258). They need the network of connections to stay alive.

These findings suggest that there are multiple practices that sustain internationalization, across scales and locales. In order to understand the multi-scalar actors, a linear approach to policy analysis cannot show this multiplicity. In searching for what connects multi-scalar actors, I found that it is not one policy or one event. As I talked to participants, I began to see the diversity of actors involved and the multiple practices that sustain internationalization in linking actors. It was not possible to find one policy that could be traced as a thread between actors and their sites. The connection is not that neat. Indeed, Latour (1999b) suggested that networks are not like railroad tracks, with direct paths and stop and connections. Rather, the fractures, connections and webs

spread out like cracks in cement. Tracing what connects them requires following the actors.

Internationalization of higher education is not located in the university alone. As internationalization is wrapped up in the efforts of nation states towards the global knowledge economy, policy responses to internationalization emerged from many locations. In this study, provincial governments, Canadian federal government ministries, professional organizations in other countries, national governments' ministries, embassy offices, international research centres in other countries are enrolled into internationalization projects and efforts at the Canadian university. It is the collective action across scales that produces internationalization and so, when looking to understand the sites of power, the analysis must extend beyond the university site alone. Assemblage thinking brings these connections to the fore.

The Power of Policy Spaces and Internationalization of Higher Education Policy

If we accept a multiplicity of actors enrolled in the assemblages of internationalization, then our understanding of power must accommodate this plurality. Latour (1987) argued that power is consequence of collective action, a product of intensive activity of enrolling, convincing and enlisting actors. In this sense, power is the outcome of social processes, and analysis must focus on the "processes that give rise to power" (Murdoch & Marsden, 1995, p. 371). As Latour states, "Therefore, to 'explain' power…we need to examine how collective action comes about, or how actors come to be associated, and how they work in unison" (p. 276).

In this study, I have focused not only on Latour's notions of collective power, but also on Gaventa's (2006) triad of power – that power relations can be conceived in policy as visible, hidden and invisible. In his work, Gaventa worked towards a participatory, democratic ideal of change that challenges the obscure ways involved in the inequities and imbalances of how resources are held, managed and distributed. His concern is for emancipatory change that goes beyond failing attempts to create new institutional arrangements that have so far been insufficient at policy change for democratic participation. He argued that rhetorical change is not enough; what is needed is a better "understanding on the nature of the power relations which surround and imbue these new, potentially more democratic, spaces" (p. 23). Essentially, his project called for knowing where power lies and how it can be interrupted.

Gaventa (2006) himself wrote of the promise of ANT in bringing about an important shift in how we think about power relations, though he failed to express specifically the relation he saw between his work and Latour's. From the analysis in my research, I agree with Gaventa that Latour's notion of collective power offered a response to Gaventa's call for a different understanding of power and propose that assemblage thinking offers two opportunities for changing how understand power relations in policy. First, searching for the assemblages that form in the enrolling of actors into policy networks takes us beyond the notion of the lone powerful actor at the centre of internationalization. The work of enrolling, convincing and enlisting others resides not only with one actor alone. As Mol (2010b) contended, actors get together to create reality: "Actors associate with other actors, thus forming a network in which they are all made into 'actors' as the associations allow each of them to act. Actors are enacted,

enabled and adapted by their associates while in turn enacting, enabling and adapting these" (p. 260). This work rejects the notion of a central, coordinating, strategizing actor, "suggest[ing] that all the entities/actors associating deserve credit for the action involved in their getting together" (p. 264).

However, that is not to suggest that dominating actors should be let off the hook. Colonization and domination are real and their effects in internationalization have brought devastating effects to societies and individuals across the globe. As Quijano (2000) maintained, the current hegemonic model of global power is embedded in structures and processes of globalization. Gaventa (2006) pointed to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and its crippling policies on democratic engagements by citizens affected by its work. Yet, the assemblage analysis suggests we need dig deeper than the visible ways in which power relations dominate. Of course, we can see the work of powerful actors such as the IMF for what they do and fail to change. However, the assemblage analysis requires that we look at ways that Mol (2010b) asks us to look at all entities whose constant enrolling and enlisting of others makes the powerful hold stable.

The second opportunity assemblage thinking brings to power analysis is that the ways in which the hidden and invisible actors become the focus of attention, the analysis shifts to be able to know the ways in which those on the periphery have agency for change. If we hold that it is the collective action of many that generate power, then there are opportunities to act differently. As Law (2008) suggests, "The question becomes: how to interfere in and diffract realities in particular locations to generate more respectful and less dominatory alternatives. How to trope, to bend versions of the real, to strengthen

desirable realities that would otherwise be weak" (p. 637). This interference is the ontological politics at play (Gorur, 2011).

Chapter Eight: Conclusion

Virginia Woolf (1929) poetically reminds us that connections permeate our existence. In this research, I conducted a study aimed at describing the relationships between multi-scalar levels of governance produced in the connections between policy actors in the internationalization of higher education. I drew upon actor-network theory (Latour, 2005; Law, 2009) to describe power relations produced through the interactions between multi-scalar actors, tracing how the relationships between global, national and local policy spheres are enacted as actors assembled in educational governance through their engagements with policy.

Overview of the Study

I adopted an ethnographic approach to studying policy (Schatz, 2009a; Wedeen, 2009; Yanow, 2011) to trace the policy processes of internationalization within a multi-scalar network of policymakers. Policies themselves became the sites of study (Yanow, 2011). Beginning at a Canadian university, I traced the emerging network of multi-scalar actors that are connected to this university, to interrogate how relationships between multi-scalar institutions are negotiated in the interactions between these actors and the ways in which spaces such as global, national, and local actors across these multi-scalar levels come to be defined and maintained as powerful sites in the policy processes of contemporary governance.

I drew upon the insights of actor-network theory (ANT) for this study. ANT is based on an ontology of relations, a material-semiotic approach that treats "everything in the social and natural worlds as a continuously generated effect of the webs of relations within which they are located. It assumes that nothing has reality or form outside the

enactment of those relations" (Law, 2009, p. 141). Latour (1999b) suggest ANT is a sociology of associations (Latour, 1999b) that is inherently concerned with the mechanics of power:

> How some kinds of interactions more or less succeed in stabilising and reproducing themselves: how it is that they overcome resistance and seem to become 'macrosocial'; how it is they seem to generate the effects of such power, fame, size scope or organisation which we are all familiar…how, in other words, size, power or organisation are generated. (Law, 2009, p. 2)

The study methods involved document analysis, interview and observation of key meetings. I analyzed the university's strategic plan and its plan for internationalization as a means of becoming familiar with the context of the university. My focus in this step of document analysis was on what policies *do* (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010; Shore & Wright, 2011), how actors come together or in ANT terms, are enrolled into networks through the policies, and which actors are included and excluded in these network. Drawing on ANT, actors in this case meant both people and material objects, i.e. policy documents and strategic plans, as they work to connect and assemble a heterogeneous network of actors. In doing so, I looked for policies that were actively promoting internationalization, such as the university strategic document and the university plan for internationalization. I considered which other actors were enrolled discursively in those texts, even those that seemed surprising or not obvious, and "how relations [were] being assembled and ordered" in the production of other objects, subjects and locations.

Semi-structured interviews with 19 participants were used to talk with policymakers and other key actors about their work. Participants included senior level administrators at the university, professors, research officers, provincial government

bureaucrats, and senior policymakers at national organizations in the field of higher education. The purpose of the interviews was to provide an opportunity to talk with individuals about their work, to ask about the partners with whom they work and the roles of their partners. The questions were open-ended to allow for the participants to offer and discuss the aspects of their work in policy that are important to each of them. The purpose of interview in ANT is to consider what actors do, not what they mean, as Latour, 1999a stipulated, "actors know what they do and we have to learn from them not only what they do, but how and why they do it" (p. 20).

I attended key meetings that participants attended. I was granted permission by a senior administrator at the university to attend the faculty-wide meeting focused on internationalization issues. Additionally, I attended a regularly scheduled meeting held by the provincial government with policy makers and administrators from post-secondary institutions across the province that were working on internationalization issues and strategies.

In the analysis, I identified three policy networks that assembled around three different policies: 1) a memorandum of understanding, 2) a proposal for funding, and 3) strategic plans for internationalization from national level organizations. The findings are summarized in the following section.

Findings

In the data and analysis sections of the thesis, I focused on three different policy texts and networks the ways in which these texts assembled different actors, both human and non-human.

Memorandum of understanding: The power of multiplicity. In the first policy, I focused on Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) through data that shows the many ways in which participants talked about the role of MOUs in internationalization. Drawing on the work of Annemarie Mol (2010b), I argued that there is a tinkering in how the MOU comes to be performed in multiple ways. By showing that there were many performances of the MOU in the relations between different actors, I challenged the notion that MOUs are finalized, static documents. Rather, I suggested that they sometimes appear as punctuated moments in which signatures gather on a page and disappear into file cabinets. However, the analysis in that chapter showed that considering them as punctualized entities hides the many actions and decisions that are required to bring the MOU into being. That is, the multiplicity of performances shows that connections in the networks around internationalization are forged not only in the momentous experiences of receiving large funding grants, but also in the simple acts of signing and not signing that often are considered apolitical, benign acts.

I also drew on Latour's (1986) notion of power, that the act of defining what holds everyone together is how power is generated, to argue that the multiplicity of the MOU is what makes it powerful in assembling how internationalization work is performed. Some actors are included and other excluded; some knowledges are valued and other marginalized. The tinkering involves a process of change, shift, and fluidity that redefine the relations between actors as the political decision-making around which projects receive MOUs in which conditions.

In this chapter, I showed that scales of local and global are challenges as actors, which seemed far removed are enrolled into local contexts through engagements with

MOUs. As an example, I discussed the role of embassies in internationalization at the level of the university. While we do not see them visibly by focusing only the level of the university, their presence in the network is known when we study the ways that actors are brought together through policy texts like MOUs.

Proposals for funding: The power of knowledge. In the second policy network, I examined the way a proposal for funding was described by a participant to be an important actor in bringing together knowledges for a research project. While the dominance of neoliberalism has privileged market rationalities in higher education (Olssen, 2004), proposals for funding may be viewed as straightforward funding mechanism, the means to achieve economic partnerships. However, data collected in interviews with two professors and the observations in a university level meeting show how the network that is gathered around the proposal is more complex. While a proposal may seem a *punctuation* (Law, 1992), I discussed how this presence black-boxes the heterogeneous network of interactions between many different actors: between funding opportunities, calls for proposals, institutional strategies and priorities, actors located the local university setting and those that are geographically distanced from the university (CIDA and embassy staff, practitioners working in the field in what is the local context of the research project site). When viewed from this perspective, the proposal can be seen as part of the network that forms the social relation between these different actors. Indeed, the proposal is not just the work of one grant writer or researcher alone. The process of writing the proposal, in bringing it into being, mediated the social relations between many actors to bring them closer into the locale of internationalization as it is performed through this work.

I also showed how participants discussed the educative nature of policies, as some participants described using president speeches for the vision of the university, institutional strategies designating priority of resources and projects, and experiences from politicians, diplomats and practitioners in the field. The knowledges from these actors were key to building what internationalization came to mean in the interactions between many actors. As Nespor (1994) stated, learning and knowledge are not properties of individual actors (Nespor, 1994) and contrasting views of what counts as legitimate knowledge played out as the proposal writing was deemed collaborative and successful by some participants, and costly and prohibitive, by others. As knowledges emerge as contrasting and diverse, assemblages are fluid and contested and act as "frameworks of power" (p. 9).

The professor in charge of the project spent much time developing this proposal, but what comes to be performed through the proposal is not through his efforts alone. The proposal presents itself as a final entity, but it involved a myriad of actions in order to sustain it as such: for example, supporting the proposal writing by the international office at the university, strategizing connections between the field of the project located in the continent of Africa and the plans for internationalization at the university, engaging federal priorities for addressing a global social issue with the teaching practices in classrooms at the university.

In conclusion, I suggest the proposal as a text does more than describe actors; "it *creates* them, *constitutes* them (and me), not as fixed essences…but as 'contestable and constrained stories' (Hathaway, 1989)" (Nespor, 1994, p. 10). The identity of local comes to be both assigned and assumed by actors through the activities of the proposal, as actors

become meaningful to the project. In this chapter, I showed how the proposal as a text draws distant actors in regardless of their physical distance. Embassy officials, practitioners and ministry officials in the partnering country are enrolled as local, meaning essential, in the ways their knowledges define the project through the proposal, redefining how we understand what it means to be local in internationalization work.

National strategies for internationalization: Controversies of internationalization as object multiple. The most complex network that I traced emerged around internationalization policy statements and position papers related to immigration, trade and the marketing of international education. The complexity of this network showed the multiplicity of performances that ANT analyses aim to explore. These policy networks assembled around two documents from two national organizations: 1) Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade's (DFAIT) report, *International Education: A Key Driver of Canada's Economic Prosperity,* commonly called "The Chakma Report" referring to Amit Chakma, President of Western University who chaired the report's committee, and 2) the Council of the Federation's (COF) report, *Bringing Education in Canada to the World, Bringing the World to Canada: An Internationalization Marketing Action Plan for Provinces and Territories.* These two texts were often referred to by participants in data collected, both through interview and observation of meetings. In considering these policies as actors, I traced their connections in the network of internationalization as it was performed in different spaces.

University and provincial level actors translated these policies into practice, as different actors, both human and non-human, were enrolled into the networks formed

around these policies. Translation describes what happens when things connect, changing one another and forming links (Latour, 1987). Focusing on this process calls attention to the generation of "ordering effects such as devices, agents, institutions or organizations" (Law, 2003, p. 5).

The networks assembled around these documents involved national, provincial and local university actors that illustrate the complexity of ways in which internationalization comes to be performed in the Canadian context. Internationalization was enrolled with immigration and trade through interactions with these policy statements and the spaces in which the relations between actors were maintained, shifted and negotiated in the interactions between these internationalization performances were significant.

There were competing efforts to frame internationalization in two national policy documents. Such framing is not singular (Jolivet & Heiskanen, 2010); the performative realities of internationalization in the ways these texts are enrolled into spaces of internationalization were multiple. These multiple framings were produced through discursive practices in the text and material practices in the ways actors translate the policy into their organizations. Furthermore, these policies enrolled practices related to immigration and citizenship, as well as marketing and economic priorities, and such enrolment were controversial for university actors. The competing efforts of framing internationalization not only shaped what it meant, but also how internationalization was practiced and how actors were privileged as agential and powerful in internationalization processes. Important to this analysis is the ways in which realities co-exist and it was this multiple reality that provided tensions for university actors. That is, internationalization

presented not as a single entity but rather as an object multiple (Mol, 2010b), suggesting there are ontological politics at play in how internationalization policy is enacted across levels of engagement.

Recommendations for Research

While this study focused on exploring the connections between actors engaged in internationalization, more studies that understand what connects the federal strategies and priorities with universities is needed. This was one aspect of the project but certainly more work needs to be done to understand other policy networks that assemble around these texts. In particular, the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD) released its strategy for international education in 2014. Understanding what this policy "is" as it is enrolled in different spaces could provide a more rich understanding of how internationalization happens. As Mol (2010b) said, "as actors come to participate in different 'networks', discourses, logics and modes of ordering, practices, things get complex. The 'actors' start to differ from network to network" (p. 260). Furthermore, the federal government's strategy signals its intention to become even further entrenched in higher education. The ways its presence changes what higher education becomes is alarmingly needed.

From a methodological perspective, there is also need for ethnographic work that teases out the way reality is produced in the every day actions of those Gorur (2011) calls policy doers. ANT analyses focuses on heterogenous actors, the process of symmetry that Latour (2005) suggests is important in understanding the reality of the social world. The argument is not that in reality humans do not matter. In fact, ANT researchers are generally not concerned with "catching reality as it really is" (Mol, 2010b, p. 255).

Rather, the point is to "make specific, surprising, so far unspoken events and situations visible, audible and sensible" (p. 255). That is, it opens the possibility to look at the social life of things and the effects of the interactions between them. Ethnographic research that is embedded in observation of the life of internationalization policy doers can help to better understand catch the surprising elements of policy in its interactions with all kinds of actors. Such an approach takes time and commitment to longitudinal studies but would be a valuable way to even further interrogate internationalization policy as an actor.

Any interpretivist project that aims to understand how something "means" to participants must be cognizant of how meaning making happens (Yanow, 2011). My approach to having participants talk about their interactions with policy developed over the course of the research. In a first interview, I struggled with bringing about meaningful conversation with one participant whose own view of policy was clearly embedded in rationalist assumptions, meaning discussing what this participant "did with policy" was not something they were expecting to talk about in the interview. In one case, one participant wanted to keep going back to the statistics of the institution, suggesting, "We're good because of these numbers." Another participant explained to me the policy cycle of design, implementation and evaluation, perhaps forgetting I was a policy scholar myself. That the participant saw policy in this way no doubt shaped how he described his engagement with it. I toiled repeatedly to get him to tell me about the everyday work of how policy informs his work, and indeed, it led us to the discussion of the proposal for funding as key actor, but I was left with some lingering desires to further probe participants' understandings of policy. I think there are incredible opportunities to work with actors on understanding what policy means to them, both through discursive and

material enactments, and I look forward to doing more research in this capacity. Doing so will help us to better know how policy works, so that we can further avoid the rationalist trap of statistical data representing all that can be known about a phenomena. Internationalization policy must be "evaluated" based on more than numerical value.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

If we understand internationalization policy as an assemblage, as it is brought to reality through the interactions between heterogeneous actors across scales, then we ought to treat it as this heterogeneous entity. We should question who is privileged in the connections we make and how the materialities with which we connect shape who we become in internationalization. There is an appeal to the democratic nature of higher educations that seems to be diminishing in the neoliberalization of teaching, learning and research. As Mol (1999) reminded us, if the world is constructed, it can be done so otherwise. Understanding the ontological politics in which we are engaged through our own instances of inclusion and exclusion are the exact moments for change.

Relatedly, multiple realities of internationalization can exist, but we should spend time thinking about how they work together. While research can play a role in this, in practice, we should be open to the possibility that there may be many assemblages of internationalization in which we are enrolled and thinking about how they relate can help us to understand the tensions that emerge through co-existence in internationalization work.

Internationalization policy permeates our institutions but this research shows that its reach extends beyond the boundaries of the university itself. While I agree with Gaventa that power relations are not always visible, indeed they rarely are, those

involved in internationalization ought to be aware that their actions are important beyond the walls of one institution alone. Questioning how different interests are enrolled through policies is an important step of knowing the effects of the connections we aim to make. Paying attention to how we assemble and what connects internationalization across sites is about the process, rather than the outcome, of internationalization. Efforts to monitor, evaluate and reflect on these processes could focus on the materialities of policy – what are the things that matter?

Finally, this research shows that policy is more than text. Policymakers and doers have an equal responsibility to approach their policy work with recognition of the performative nature of policy. As a policy researcher, my own commitment for communicating this to others assembled in processes of internationalization requires courage to find the spaces to both teach and learn about policy. Indeed, policy work requires courage to believe that we can do things differently if we are at all concerned about internationalization politics. As this study showed, policies assemble actors to produce knowledge, relations, spaces and opportunities. What becomes legitimate in how we value those is the work of policymakers and doers alike.

Conclusion

This study showed the ways in which policies engaged with internationalization in higher education assembled actors across scales. These assemblages were performative in the relations that emerge through internationalization. Policies such as memorandums of understanding, proposals for funding, and strategies for internationalization link local, national and global actors across these scales. The findings from this study aimed at showing the ontological politics in which policy assemblages around internationalization

engage. As Canadian universities continue to embrace internationalization, understanding the power of policies in this context continues. ANT analyses involve their own way of assembling what there is to know but in the end, connections and relations are all that we as we engage in internationalization research. How to perform our own relations as we come to better understand higher education governance is a continuing journey, but an adventurous and rewarding one.

References

Abdi, A. A. (2012). Clash of dominant discourses and African philosophies and epistemologies of education: Anti-colonial analyses. In A. A. Abdi (Ed.), *Decolonizing philosophies of education* (pp. 131 – 146). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Adams, C., & Thompson, T. (2011). Interviewing objects: Including educational technologies as qualitative research participants. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 24*(6), 733 – 750. doi: 10.1080/09518398.2010.529849

Alcadipani, R., & Hassard, J. (2010). Actor-Network Theory, organizations and critique: Towards a politics of organizing. *Organization*, *17*(4), 419-435. doi: 10.1177/1350508410364441

Altbach, P. & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3/4), 290-305.

Appadurai, A. (2001). Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *Globalization* (pp. 1-21). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Atkinson, M. A., & Coleman, W. D. (1992). Policy networks, policy communities and the problems of governance. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration, 5*(2), 154 – 180.

Auyero, J, & Joseph, L. (2007). Introduction: Politics under the microscope. In L. Joseph, M. Mahler & J. Auyero (Eds.), *New perspectives in political ethnography* (pp. 1 – 13). New York, NY: Springer.

Ball, S. J. (1998). Big policies/small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education, 34*(2), 119-129.

Ball, S. J. (2001). Global policies and vernacular politics in education. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, *1*(2), xxvii-xliii. Retrieved from http://www.curriculosemfronteiras.org/vol1iss2articles/balleng.pdf

Ball, S., & Exley, S. (2010). Making policy with 'good ideas': Policy networks and the 'intellectuals' of New Labour. *Journal of Education Policy, 25*(2), 151 – 169.

Ball, S., Maguire, M., & Braun, A. (2012). *How schools do policy: Policy enactment in the secondary school*. London, UK: Routledge.

Ball, S., Maguire, M., Braun, A., & Hoskins, K. (2011a). Disciplinary texts: A policy analysis of national and local behaviour policies. *Critical Studies in Education, 52*(1), 1 -14. doi: 10.1080/17508487.2011.536509

Ball, S., Maguire, M., Braun, A., & Hoskins, K. (2011b). Policy subjects and policy actors in schools: Some necessary but insufficient analyses. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 32*(4), 611 – 634. doi: 10.1080/01596306.2011.601564

Beerkens, E. (2004, September). *Global opportunities and institutional embeddedness.* Paper presented at Higher Education Consortia in Europe and Southeast Asia, Twente, Enschede. Retrieved from http://www.beerkens.info/files/Beerkens%20CHER%20Conference.pdf

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Boomstrom, R. (1994). Learning to pay attention. *Qualitative Studied in Education, 7*(1), 51-64.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation towards a reflexive sociology.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Braun, A., Ball, S., Maguire, M., & Hoskins, K. (2011). Policy enactments in schools introduction: Towards a toolbox for theory and research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 32*(4), 581-583. doi: 10.1080/01596306.2011.601554

Burgess, A. (2008). The literary practices of recording achievement: How a text mediates between the local and the global. *Journal of Education Policy, 23*(1), 49 – 62. doi: 10.1080/02680930701754088

Callon, M. (1986). Some elements of a sociology of translation: domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St Brieuc Bay. In J. Law (Ed.), *Power, action and belief: a new sociology of knowledge?* (pp. 196-223). London, UK: Routledge.

Coleman, W., & Skogstad, G. (1990). Policy communities and policy networks: A structural approach. In W. Coleman & G. Skogstad (Eds.), *Policy communities and public policy in Canada* (pp. 14 - 33). Toronto, ON: Copp Clark Pitman.

Commission on Global Governance. (1995). *Our global neighbourhood.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Cordella, A., & Shaikh, M. (2006). From epistemology to ontology: Challenging the constructed "truth" of ANT. Retrieved from http://is2.lse.ac.uk/wp/pdf/WP143.PDF

Crawford, C. (2005). Actor network theory. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *Dictionary of social theory* (pp. 1 – 3). London, UK: Sage.

Dale, R., & Robertson, S. (2007a). Beyond methodological 'isms' in comparative education in an era of globalisation. In A. Kazamias & R. Cowan (Eds.), *International handbook on comparative education* (pp. 1113-1127). London, UK: Springer.

Dale, R., & Robertson, S. (2007b). New arenas of education governance: Reflections and directions. In K. Martens, A. Rusconi, & K. Leuze (Eds.), *New arenas of education governance: The impact of international organizations and markets on educational policy making* (pp. 217 - 228). London, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Introduction. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983) The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*, 147-160.

Dryzek, J. (1990). *Discursive democracy: Politics, policy and political science*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dryzek, J. (2006). Policy analysis as critique. In M. Moran, M. Rein & R. Goodin (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political science* (pp. 190 – 203). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Dryzek, J., & Dunleavy, P. (2009). *Theories of the democratic state.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmilan.

Dyer, C. (1999). Researching the implementation of educational policy: A backward mapping approach. *Comparative Education, 35*(1), 45 – 61. doi: 10.1080/03050069928062

Edwards, R. (2002). Mobilizing lifelong learning: Governmentality in educational practices. *Journal of Education Policy, 17*(3), 353-365. doi: 10.1080/02680930210127603

Edwards, R. (2011). Translating the prescribed into the enacted curriculum in college and school. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 43*(S1), 38 – 54. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2009.00602

Ellis, J. (1998a). Interpretive inquiry as a formal research process. In J. Ellis (Ed.), *Teaching from understanding* (p. 15-32). New York, NY: Garland.

Ellis, J. (1998b). Introduction: The teacher as interpretive inquirer. In J. Ellis (Ed.), *Teaching from understanding* (p. 3-14). New York, NY: Garland.

Ellis, J. (2006). Researching children's experiences hermeneutically and holistically. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 52*(3), 111 – 126.

Elmore, R. F. (1979). Backward mapping: Implementation research and policy decisions. *Political Science Quarterly, 94*(4), 601 – 616. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2149628

Enders, J., & de Weert, E. (2004). Science, training and career: Changing modes of knowledge production and labour markets. *Higher Education Policy, 17*, 135-152.

Fenwick, T. (2010a). Re-thinking the 'thing': Sociomaterial approaches to understanding and researching in work. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 22*(1/2), 104 – 116. doi: 10.1108/13665621011012898

Fenwick, T. (2010b). un(Doing) standards in education with actor-network theory. *Journal of Education Policy, 25*(2), 117 – 133. doi: 10.1080/02680930903314277

Fenwick, T., & Edwards, R. (2010). *Actor-network theory in education*. London, UK: Routledge.

Fenwick, T., Edwards, R., & Sawchuk, P. (2011). *Emerging approaches to educational research: Tracing the socio-material.* London, UK: Routledge.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 12*(2), 219-245. doi: 10.1177/1077800405284363

Gale, T. (2001). Critical policy sociology: Historiography, archaeology and genealogy as methods of policy analysis. *Journal of Educational Policy, 16*(5), 379 - 393.

Gaventa, J. (2006). Finding spaces for change: A power analysis. *IDS Bulletin, 37*(6), 23-33 .

Goldberg, M. (2006). Discursive policy webs in a globalization era: A discussion of access to professions and trades for immigrant professionals in Ontario, Canada. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 4*(1), 77 – 102. doi: 10.1080/14767720600555103

Gorur, R. (2011). Policy as assemblage. *European Educational Research Journal, 10*(14), 611 – 622. *doi:* 10.2304/eerj.2011.10.4.611

Government of Alberta. (2009). *International education framework.* Retrieved from http://aet.alberta.ca/media/254310/intleducationframework.pdf

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hartmann, E. (2008). Bologna goes global: A new imperialism in the making? *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 6*(3), 207 – 220. doi: 10.1080/14767720802343308

Hajer, M., & Wagenaar, H. (2003). Introduction. In M. Hajer & H. Wagenaar (Eds.), *Deliberative policy analysis: Understanding governance in the network society* (pp. 1–30). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism.* London: Oxford.

Herbert-Cheshire, L. (2003). Translating policy: Power and action in Australia's country towns. *Sociologia Ruralis, 43*(4), 454–473.

Jones, G. A. (2009). Internationalization and higher education policy in Canada: Three challenges. In R. D. Trilokekar, G. A. Jones & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global* (pp. 355-369). Toronto, ON: James Lorimer.

Jessop, B. (2000). Institutional re(turns) and the strategic - relational approach. *Environment and Planning A*, *33*(7), 1213 – 1235. doi:10.1068/a32183

Jessop, B. (2003). *Globalization and the national state.* Retrieved from http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/jessop-globalization-and-the-national-state.pdf

Jessop, B. (2004). Multi-level governance and multi-level metagovernance. In I. Bache & M. Finders (Eds.), *Multi-level governance* (pp. 49-74). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Jones, G. A. (2009). Internationalization and higher education policy in Canada: Three challenges. In R. D. Trilokekar, G. A. Jones & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global* (pp. 355-369). Toronto, ON: James Lorimer.

Jolivet, E., & Heiskanen, E. (2010). Blowing against the wind: An exploratory application of actor network theory to the analysis of local controversies and participation processes in wind energy. *Energy Policy, 38,* 6746-6754.

Latour, B. (1987). The powers of association. In J. Law (Ed.), *Power, action and belief: A new sociology of knowledge?* (pp. 264 – 280). London, UK: Routledge.

Latour, B. (1988). *The Pasteurization of France.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (1999a). On recalling ANT. In J. Law & J. Hassard (Eds.), *Actor network theory and after* (pp. 15 - 25). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Latour, B. (1999b). *The trouble with actor-network theory*. Retrieved from http://www.cours.fse.ulaval.ca/edc-65804/latour-clarifications.pdf

Latour, B. (2003). *The promises of construction*. Retrieved from http://www.bruno-latour.fr/sites/default/files/87-CONSTRUCTIVISM-GB.pdf

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: an introduction to actor-network theory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Law, J. (1992). Notes on the theory of the actor-network: Ordering, strategy and heterogeneity. *Systems Practice,* 5(4), 379-393.

Law, J. (1999). After ANT: Complexity, naming and topology. In J. Law & J. Hassard (Eds.), *Actor network theory and after* (pp. 1-14). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Law, J. (2003). *Notes on the theory of the actor network: Ordering, strategy and heterogeneity.* Retrieved from http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/law-notes-on-ant.pdf

Law, J. (2009). Actor network theory and material semiotics. In B. S. Turner (Ed.), *The new Blackwell companion to social theory (3rd ed.)* (pp. 141 – 158). Chichester, UK: Blackwell.

Law, J. (2012). Collateral realities. In F. D. Rubio & P. Baert (Eds), *The politics of knowledge* (pp. 156-178). London, UK: Routledge.

Law, J., & Urry, J. (2003). *Enacting the social.* Retrieved from http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/law-urry-enacting-the-social.pdf

Lawrence, T., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, W. R. Nord & T. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 215-254). London, UK: Sage.

Leuze, K., Martens, K., & Rusconi, A. (2007). New arenas of education governance: The impact of international organizations and markets on education policy making. In K. Martens, A. Rusconi, & K. Leuze (Eds.), *New arenas of education governance: The impact of international organizations and markets on educational policy making* (pp. 3-15). London, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Marginson, S. (2009). Notes on globalization and higher education: With some reference to the case of Australia. In R. D. Trilokekar, G. A. Jones & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global* (pp. 17-64). Toronto, ON: James Lorimer.

Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education, 43,* 281-309.

McGee, R. (2004). Unpacking policy: Actors, knowledge and spaces. In K. Brock, R. McGee, & J. Gaventa (Eds.), *Knowledge, actors and spaces in poverty reduction in Uganda and Nigeria* (pp. 1–26). Brighton, UK: Fountain.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). The analysis of interview-narratives. In T. R. Sarbin (Ed.), *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct* (pp. 233 – 255). New York, NY: Praeger.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. (2011). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* Wiley.

Meyer, J., Boli, J., Thomas, G., & Ramirez, F. (1997). World society and the nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology, 103*(1), 144 – 181.

Meyer, J., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340 - 363.

Mol, A. (1999) Ontological politics: A word and some questions. In J. Law & J. Hassard (Eds), *Actor network theory and after* (pp. 74 – 88). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Mol, A. (2010a). Good care and its values: Good food in the nursing home. In A. Mol, I. Moser & J. Pols (Eds.), *Care in practice: On tinkering in clinics, homes and farms* (pp. 215 – 234). Bielefeld, Germany: Transcript.

Mol, A. (2010b). Actor-network theory: Sensitive terms and enduring tensions. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 50*, 253-269.

Mol, A. (1999). Ontological politics. In J. Law & J. Hassard (Eds.), *Actor network theory and after* (pp. 74-89). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Naidoo, R. (2004). Fields and institutional strategy: Bourdieu on the relationship between higher education, inequality and society. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 25*(4), 457-471. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4128671

Nespor, J. (2004). Education scale-making. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 12*(3), 309-326.

O'Connor, K. (2014). MOOCs, institutional policy and change dynamics in higher education. *Higher Education, 68,* 623 – 635. doi: 10.1007/s10734-014-9735-z

O'Malley, P. (1996). Indigenous governance. *Economy and Society, 25*(3), 310 – 336.

Olssen, M. (2004). Neoliberalism, globalisation, democracy: Challenges for education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 2*(2), 231-245. doi: 10.1080/14767720410001733665

Olssen, M. (2009). Neoliberalism, education, and the rise of the global common good. In M. Simons, M. Olssen & M. Peters (Eds.) *Re-reading education policies: A handbook for studying the policy agenda of the 21st century* (pp.433 – 457). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Olssen, M., & Peters, M. (2005) Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(3), 313-345. doi: 10.1080/02680930500108718

Ozga, J. (2005). Modernizing the education workforce: A perspective from Scotland. *Educational Review, 57*(2), 207 – 219. doi: 10.1080/0013191042000308 37

Pal, L. A. (2006). *Beyond policy analysis: Public issue management in turbulent times.* Scarborough, ON: Nelson Education.

Patton, M. Q. (1985). *Quality in qualitative research: Methodological principles and recent development*. Invited address to Division J of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1985.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. In J. A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.), *Life history and narrative* (pp. 5-23). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Poulantzas, N. (1975). *Classes in contemporary capitalism.* London, UK: New Left Books.

Poulantzas, N. (1978). *State, power and socialism.* London, UK: Verso.

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from the South, 1*(3), 533-580.

Resnick, J. (2006). International organizations, the "education-economic growth" black box and the development of world education culture. *Comparative Education Review, 50*(2), 173-15.

Rizvi, F. (2006). Imagination and the globalisation of educational policy research. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 4*(2), 193-205.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2000). Globalization and education: Complexities and contingencies. *Educational Theory, 50*(4), 419- 426.

Robertson, S. (2005). Re-imagining and re-scripting the future of education: Global knowledge economy discourses and the challenge to education systems. *Comparative Education, 41*(2), 151-170.

Robertson, S. L., Dale, R., Moutsios, S., Nielsen, G., Shore, C. & Wright, S. (2012). Globalisation and regionalism in higher education: Toward a new conceptual framework. In S. Wright (Ed.), *Working papers on University Reform*, Working paper 20, EPOKE, Department of Education, Aarhus University.

Rosenau, J. N., & Czempiel, E. O. (1992). *Governance without government: Order and change in world politics.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schatz, E. (2009a). Ethnographic immersion and the study of politics. In E. Schatz (Ed.), *Political ethnography: What immersion contributes to the study of power* (pp. 1-22). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Schatz, E. (2009b). What kind(s) of ethnography does political science need? In E. Schatz (Ed.), *Political ethnography: What immersion contributes to the study of power* (pp. 303 - 318). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Scholte, J. A. (2000). *Globalization: A critical introduction*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Seidman, I. E. (1991). *Interviewing as qualitative research.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shore, C. (2011). Espionage, policy and the art of government: The British Secret Services and the war on Iraq. In C. Shore, S. Wright & D. Pero (Eds.), *Policy worlds: Anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power* (pp. 169 - 186). New York, NY: Berghahn.

Shore, C., & Wright, S. (2011). Conceptualising policy: Technologies of governance and the politics of visibility. In C. Shore, S. Wright & D. Pero (Eds.), *Policy worlds: Anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power* (pp. 1 - 26). New York, NY: Berghahn.

Shubert, A., Jones, G. A., & Trilokekar, R. D. (2009). Introduction. In R. D. Trilokekar, G. A. Jones & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global* (pp. 7 - 15). Toronto, ON: James Lorimer.

Shultz, L. (2012). Decolonizing social justice education: From policy knowledge to citizenship action. In A. A. Abdi (Ed.), *Decolonizing philosophies of education* (pp. 29 - 42). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Shultz, L., & Viczko, M. (2012). *Canadian higher education responses to the Bologna Process: Questions of legitimacy, authority and autonomy*. Paper to be presented at the 5th World Universities Forum, Rhodes, Greece.

Skogstad, G. (2006, June). *Policy networks and policy communities: Conceptual evolution and governing realities.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association. London, ON. Retrieved from http://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/papers-2005/Skogstad.pdf

Smith, D. G. (1991) The hermeneutic imagination and the pedagogic text. In E. C. Short (Ed.), *Forms of curriculum inquiry* (pp. 187-209). New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Trilokekar, R. D. (2009). The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Canada: Providing leadership in the internationalization of Canadian higher education. In R. D. Trilokekar, G. A. Jones & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global* (pp. 98 - 118). Toronto, ON: James Lorimer.

van Hulst, M., & Yanow, D. (2014). From policy "frames" to "framing": Theorizing a more dynamic, political approach. *American Review of Public Administration,* 1-21.

van der Wende, M. (2001). The international dimension in national higher education policies: What has changed in Europe in the last five years. *European Journal of Education, 36*(4), 431 – 441.

Viczko, M. (2011, June). *Selectivity in higher education governance: Policy actors, knowledge and spaces in discourses of internationalization*. Paper presented at the 6th annual meeting of the Interpretive Policy Analysis Conference, Cardiff, UK.

Viczko, M. (2010, October). *Democratic and participatory spaces: Challenges and opportunities for higher education through policy networks*. Paper presented at the 7th International Workshop on Higher Education Reform (HER), Vancouver, BC.

Viczko, M., & Shultz, L. (2010, June). *Re-bordering new possibilities in higher education: Considering policy actors, knowledge and spaces in discourses of internationalization.* Paper presented at the XIV World Congress of Comparative Education Societies, Istanbul, Turkey.

Vidovich, L. (2004). Global-national-local dynamics in policy processes: A case of 'quality' policy in higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 25*(3), 341 – 354. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4128693

Wagenaar, H. (2011). *Meaning in action: Interpretation and dialogue in policy analysis*. London, UK: M. E. Sharpe.

Weber, L. (2007). Internationalization at Canadian universities: Where are we now? *Brock Education, 16*(2), 38-43.

Wedeen, L. (2009). Ethnography as interpretive enterprise. In E. Schatz (Ed.), *Political ethnography: What immersion contributes to the study of power* (pp. 75 – 93). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Weinstein, D., & Weinstein, M. A. (1991). Georg Simmel: Sociological flaneur bricoleur. *Theory, Culture & Society, 8*, 151-168.

Woolf, V. (1929). *A room of one's own.* London, UK: Penguin.

Wright, S., & Reinhold, S. (2011). 'Studying through': A strategy for studying political transformation. Or sex, lies and British politics. In C. Shore, S. Wright & D. Pero (Eds.), *Policy worlds: Anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power* (pp. 86 - 104). New York, NY: Berghahn.

Yanow, D. (1995). Practices of policy interpretation. *Policy Sciences, 28*(2), 111 – 126. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4532344

Yanow, D. (2000). *Conducting interpretive policy analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yanow, D. (2003). Accessing local knowledge. In M. Hajer & H. Wagenaar (Eds.), *Policy analysis: Understanding governance in the networked society* (pp. 228 – 246). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Yanow, D. (2009). Dear author, dear reader: The third hermeneutic in writing and reviewing ethnography. In E. Schatz (Ed.), *Political ethnography: What immersion contributes to the study of power* (pp. 275-302). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Yanow, D. (2011). A policy ethnographer's reading of policy anthropology. In C. Shore, S. Wright & D. Pero (Eds.), *Policy worlds: Anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power* (pp. 300 - 313). New York, NY: Berghahn.

Zgaga, P. (2009, September). Education for a “better world”: International co-operation between nationalism and globalism. *Proceedings of the EMUNI Conference on Higher Education and Research, Slovenia*. Retrieved from http://www.emuni.si/Files//Denis/Conferences/EMUNI_HER/Proceedings/Keynote_speeches/Pavel_Zgaga.pdf

Appendices

Appendix 1: Information and Consent Letter to Participants

Enacting Globalized Policy Spaces in the Governance of Higher Education

Date

Dear (Name of Participant),

My name is Melody Viczko. I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Alberta. I am involved in a research project for my PhD thesis on the governance of higher education internationalization policies and practices.

I am conducting a study that will examine the how policy actors from various levels of governance (ie. local, provincial, national and international) work together related to internationalization policies. I hope that this study will yield insights for policymakers and those working in internationalization, provide direction for future research, and guide policy development.

I am sending you this letter to invite you to participate in this study.

During this study, I will use the following research methods:

- Confidential interviews
  - 1-2 semi-structured interviews lasting between 30 to 60 minutes. The interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed.
- Observation of planning meetings
  - If appropriate and with your consent, I would be interested to attend planning meetings related to internationalization policy development, though I will not audio-record these meetings. Confidentiality and anonymity of all people at the meeting will be ensured.
- Document analysis
  - I intend to collect policies, strategic plans and positions papers related to internationalization of higher education.

The interviews will be audio-recorded. As a participant, you will be provided with the opportunity to check the data as it is collected. Transcripts of the interviews will be transcribed by personnel who will agree to abide by a confidentiality agreement.

Participation in this study is voluntary and you have the following rights:

- To not participate in the study.
- To withdraw at any time without prejudice to pre-existing entitlements, and to continuing and meaningful opportunities for deciding whether or not to continue to participate.

- To opt out without penalty and to have any collected data withdrawn from the data base and not included in the study. If you choose to opt out of the study, data will be withdrawn and returned to you prior to data analysis. Also, you will have the opportunity to look at the transcripts of the interviews to ensure that they capture your intended meaning and to ensure that any identifying information has been removed from your documents. This will be the participants' final opportunity to withdraw from the study.
- To privacy, anonymity and confidentiality. Participants' name will not appear on any information presented. In any publications or reports, I will refer to participants and organizations with pseudonyms. Each participant will have the opportunity to review the final document and will have the right to request that information that might identify him/her be deleted from the completed report.
- To safeguards for security of data. The data will be stored for a minimum of five years in the Department of Educational Policy Studies (as required by University of Alberta guidelines), and will not allow for identification of any individual. Given these precautions, there are no foreseeable risks in this study. After the data analysis, all data will be destroyed in a way that ensures privacy and confidentiality.
- To disclosure of the presence of any apparent or actual conflict of interest on the part of the researcher(s).
- To a copy of a report of the research findings. You can indicate your interest to receiving a copy of the research findings by emailing me at mviczko@ualberta.ca.

The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines and approved by Research Ethics Board 1 at the University of Alberta. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the Research Ethics Office at (780) 492-2615. Additionally, you may contact Dr. L. Shultz, my supervisor, at the University of Alberta at (780) 492-4441.

I am providing two copies of this introductory and consent letter, one to be signed and returned and one for you to keep for your own records.

Sincerely,

Melody Viczko
7-104 Education North
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB T6G 2G5
(780) 707-5464 Email: mviczko@ualberta.ca

I, _____, understand the guidelines above, agree to participate in this study and have received a copy of this consent form for my records.

Participant's signature: _____ Researcher's signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Descriptive Question Matrix

	SPACE	OBJECT	ACTIVITY	TIME	ACTOR	GOAL	FEELING
SPACE	*Can you describe in detail all the places?*	What are all the ways space is organized by objects?	What are all the ways space is organized by activities?	What spatial changes occur over time?	What are all the ways space is used by actors?	What are all the ways space is related to goals?	What places are associated with feelings?
OBJECT	Where are objects located?	*Can you describe in detail all the objects?*	What are all the ways objects are used in activities?	How are objects used at different times?	What are all the ways objects are used by actors?	How are objects used in seeking goals?	What are all the ways objects evoke feelings?
ACTIVITY	What are all the places activities occur?	What are all the ways activities incorporate objects?	*Can you describe in detail all the activities?*	How do activities vary at different times?	What are all the ways activities involve actors?	What are all the ways activities involve goals?	How do activities involve feelings?
TIME	Where do time periods occur?	What are all the ways time affects objects?	How do activities fall into time periods?	*Can you describe in detail all the time periods?*	When are all the times actors are "on stage"?	How are goals related to time periods?	When are feelings evoked?
ACTOR	Where do actors place themselves?	What are all the ways actors use objects?	How are actors involved in activities?	How do actors change over time or at different times?	*Can you describe in detail all the actors?*	Which actors are linked to which goals?	What are the feelings experienced by actors?
GOAL	Where are goals sought and achieved?	What are all the ways goals involve use of objects?	What activities are goal seeking or linked to goals?	Which goals are scheduled for which times?	How do the various goals affect the various actors?	*Can you describe in detail all the goals?*	What are all the ways goals evoke feelings?
FEELING	Where do the various feeling states occur?	What feelings lead to the use of what objects?	What are all the ways feelings affect activities?	How are feelings related to various time periods?	What are all the ways feelings involve actors?	What are the ways feelings influence goals?	*Can you describe in detail all the feelings?*

Modified from Spradley, J. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. The original matrix included columns and rows for ACTS and EVENTS.